arXiv:1412.7076v1 [math.PR] 22 Dec 2014

APPROXIMATE ULTRAMETRICITY FOR RANDOM MEASURES AND APPLICATIONS TO SPIN GLASSES

AUKOSH JAGANNATH

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a notion called "Approximate Ultrametricity" which encapsulates the phenomenology of a sequence of random probability measures having supports that behave like ultrametric spaces insofar as they decompose into nested balls. We provide a sufficient condition for a sequence of random probability measures on the unit ball of an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space to admit such a decomposition, whose elements we call clusters. We also characterize the laws of the measures of the clusters by showing that they converge in law to the weights of a Ruelle Probability Cascade. These results apply to a large class of classical models in mean field spin glasses. We illustrate the notion of approximate ultrametricity by proving two important conjectures regarding mixed p-spin glasses.

1. Introduction

In their study of mean field spin glass models, the authors of [15] predicted that the support of the Gibbs measure should be ultrametric in the limit of an infinite number of spins. They determined that ultrametricity was a cornerstone for understanding Parisi's Replica Symmetry Breaking ansatz. Ultrametricity, they explained, accounts for the hierarchical decomposition of the Gibbs measure into "pure states" and their "linear convex combinations" by allowing one to interpret the latter as balls, which have a natural hierarchical structure in ultrametric spaces. The physics literature also characterized the laws of these pure states using the so-called Ruelle Probability Cascades (RPCs) [10, 15, 23]. (For a definition of RPCs, see the Appendix.) In his recent fundamental study, Panchenko has established this ultrametricity property for a natural limiting object, which he calls the "Asymptotic Gibbs Measure", for mean field spin glass models under a natural condition, the *Ghirlanda-Guerra identities* (see Section 1.2 for a precise definition) [19]. This leads to the natural question:

> "Is there a sense in which one can see a 'pure state' decomposition occurring at large but finite numbers of spins?"

The answer to this question has proven to be important in the physics literature not just for understanding the Replica Theory, but also its connection to the TAP approach [16]. This question was first studied by Talagrand in [27] where he obtained some partial results on this question assuming the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities, along with two other conditions, before Panchenko's proof of ultrametricity was known.

We answer this question in the affirmative. To this end, we introduce the notion of *approximate ultrametricity* to formalize the notion of a sequence of random measures behaving "asymptotically ultrametrically" in that their supports admit a decomposition into "pure state"-like clusters. We then prove that a sequence of random probability measures supported on the unit ball of an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space is approximately ultrametric provided that this sequence satisfy the Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra identities along with an additional condition which can be thought of as encoding the radii allowed for the clusters. Furthermore, we characterize the laws of the measures of the clusters by showing that they converge to those of an RPC.

As a consequence of our studies, one finds that for a large class of mean field spin glass models, the Gibbs measures do in fact admit such a decomposition at large but finite N. We discuss this in Section 2.1. To further illustrate of our results, we prove Talagrand's Orthogonal Structures conjecture and as a consequence verify the Dotsenko-Franz-Mézard conjecture in a natural regime. We state these results in Section 2.3.

Date: December 22, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G57, 60K35, 82B44, 82D30.

Key words and phrases. spin glasses, ultrametricity, Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities, mass-partitions.

We state the main definitions and results of this paper in the rest of this section which is organized as follows. In Section 1.1, we define approximate ultrametricity and the Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra identities, along with definitions necessary for understanding the main results of this paper. In Section 1.2, we state the aforementioned results. We outline the proofs of these results in Section 3.4. See Section 2.4 for an explanation of the organization of the remainder of this paper.

1.1. **The Notion of Approximate Ultrametricity.** We now state the definitions necessary to understand the statements of the main results of this paper. We begin by introducing the following notions to encapsulate the idea of a sequence of measures behaving "increasingly ultrametrically" as discussed above. We begin with the following definition. Roughly speaking, this notion should be thought of as encoding the collections of radii that are allowed for our "pure state" decompositions.

Definition 1.1.1. Let ζ be a probability measure on the interval $[-1,1]$. A finite increasing sequence of points $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ on the interval $(0,1]$ is said to be ζ-*admissible* if:

(1) They are all continuity points:
$$\zeta(\{q_k\}) = 0.$$
(2) There is mass between them:
$$\zeta([q_k, q_{k+1}]) > 0.$$
(3) Some but not all of the ζ-mass lies between 0 and q_1, and q_r and 1:
$$0 < \zeta([0,q_1]) < 1 \text{ and } 0 < \zeta([q_r,1]) < 1.$$

With this in hand we can then define what we mean by being approximately ultrametric. This definition encodes the idea that if one picks a (finite) increasing sequence of radii, then there is a sequence of sets that are hierarchically arranged by inclusion that uniformly "almost" exhaust the measure of the space and for which points within the sets are uniformly close or far depending on the relation of the sets in this hierarchy. As we will be focusing primarily on sequences of random measures on the unit ball of an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space, we will tailor the definition to this setting, though one could extend this notion to more general metric spaces. Without loss of generality, we take this Hilbert space to be ℓ_2 throughout this paper.

In the following for any α, β vertices in a tree, $|\alpha|$ means the depth of the vertex α, $\alpha \precsim \beta$ means that α is along the root vertex path to β, and $\alpha \nsim \beta$ means that α and β are on different root-vertex paths, in which case we call α and β *cousins*. Let $child(\alpha)$ be those β such that $|\beta| = |\alpha| + 1$ and for which $\alpha \precsim \beta$. For more on this notation see Section 3.1.

Definition 1.1.2. A sequence $\{\mu_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ of random measures supported on the unit ball of ℓ_2 is said to be *approximately ultrametric* with respect to the measure ζ if for every r and every ζ-admissible sequence, $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, there is a sequence of finite rooted trees of depth r, $\{\tau_{N,r}\}$, and sequences a_N, b_N, and ϵ_N all tending to 0 such that with probability tending to one, there are sets $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha\in\tau_{N,r}}$ with the following properties.

(1) The inclusion-exclusion structure of the sets is natural with respect to the partial order of $\tau_{N,r}$:
$$C_{\alpha,N} \cap C_{\beta,N} = \begin{cases} C_{\alpha,N} & \text{if } \beta \precsim \alpha. \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \beta \nsim \alpha. \end{cases}$$
(2) The sets almost exhaust the measure at every depth: for each $k \in [r]$,
$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \mu_N(C_{\alpha,N}) \geq 1 - \epsilon_N.$$
(3) For $\alpha \in \tau_{N,r} \setminus \partial\tau_{N,r}$
$$0 \leq \mu_N(C_{\alpha,N}) - \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} \mu_N(C_{\beta,N}) \leq \epsilon_N.$$
(4) Points in the same cluster are uniformly close with high probability in the environment: for every α in $\tau_{N,r}$,
$$\mu_N\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in C_{\alpha,N} : (\sigma^1,\sigma^2) \leq q_{|\alpha|} - a_N\right) \leq b_N \tag{1.1.1}$$



FIGURE 1. A collection of clusters that satisfy Definition 1.1.2. The centers of the balls are denoted by stars, the sets are denoted by the discs with wavy lines, and the measure puts even mass at all of the dots and stars. In the top left, one of the discs has a center that is too close the center of the other, so it is excised from the exhaustion.

(5) Points in clusters that are cousins are uniformly far apart: for every $\alpha \nsim \beta$ in $\tau_{N,r}$, if $\gamma \prec \alpha$ and $\eta \prec \beta$ are such that $|\gamma| = |\eta| = |\alpha \wedge \beta| + 1$, then

$$\mu_N \left(\sigma^1 \in C_\gamma, \sigma^2 \in C_\eta : (\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \geq q_{|\gamma \wedge \eta|+1} + a_N \right) \leq b_N. \tag{1.1.2}$$

We say that this sequence is *regularly* approximately ultrametric if, furthermore, there is a sequence $m_N \to \infty$ such that $\tau_{N,r}$ is the m_N-regular tree of depth r. We call these $C_{\alpha,N}$ the *clusters* corresponding to the sequence $\{q_k\}$.

Remark 1.1.3. We would like to point out here that as stated the above definition uses very little about ζ. All we needed was a notion of admissible sequences. This notion is invariant under changing the measure to an equivalent measure. If another measure ν is equivalent to ζ in the sense that there is a positive function f with $d\nu = f d\zeta$, then the class of admissible sequences for ν and ζ are the same. The reader is encouraged, however, to think of ζ as the limit of the mean law of (σ_N^1, σ_N^2) where σ_N^1 and σ_N^2 are drawn i.i.d from μ_N. The reason for this will become clear in the next section.

The first three properties together are called $(\epsilon_N, 0)$-*hierarchical exhaustion*, and the last two properties are called (a_N, b_N)-*hierarchical clustering*. For a more thorough explanation and motivation of the above definitions, see Section 3.2. Also see Figure 1.1 on page 3.

These clusters are to be compared with the "pure states" of physicists [16]. In particular, we think of them as an approximation to the pure states at a large but finite number of spins. As we shall see shortly, these clusters are constructed such that they are not only "pure state"-like in the sense of radii, but they are in fact approximately balls, this approximation becoming exact in the thermodynamic limit.

1.2. **Statement of main results.** In this paper, we obtain sufficient conditions to conclude that a sequence of random measures on the unit ball of ℓ_2 is approximately ultrametric with respect to some ζ. In the spin glass literature, a natural symmetry property of such measures has been identified as being related to ultrametricity, which we define presently. Before we do so, we need a few technical definitions.

Let μ be such a random measure on a fixed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Draw $(\sigma^i)_{i=1}^\infty$ i.i.d. from μ, that is, $\mu^{\otimes\infty}$ is a regular conditional probability distribution for $(\sigma^i(\omega))$ (see [1]). Let $R_{ij} = (\sigma^i, \sigma^j)$ be the inner product of these random variables. Here and in the following, the

subscripts always refer to the index of the element of the draw. Finally let $R^n = (R_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ be the n-by-n array of pairwise inner products of the first n draws.

With this in hand, we can then define the symmetry property.

Definition 1.2.1. We say that a sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ of random measures supported on the unit ball of ℓ_2 satisfies the *Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities* (AGGIs) if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, bounded Borel measurable f on $[-1,1]^{n^2}$, and $\psi \in C[-1,1]$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} |n\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\psi(R_{1,n+1})\right\rangle_N - \mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\right\rangle_N \mathbb{E}\left\langle \psi(R_{12})\right\rangle_N - \sum_{k=2}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\psi(R_{1k})\right\rangle_N| = 0, \tag{1.2.1}$$

where $\langle\cdot\rangle_N$ denotes the expectation with respect to μ_N, and R_{ij} and R^n are as above.

With this language we can then state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.2.2. *Let $\{\mu_N\}$ be a sequence of random probability measures supported on the unit ball of ℓ_2 on a fixed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Suppose that this sequence satisfies the Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra identities and that*

$$\zeta_N = \mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes 2}(R_{12} \in \cdot) \to \zeta$$

weakly for some ζ. Then this sequence is regularly approximately ultrametric with respect to ζ.

We are also able to characterize the laws of the sequence of weights $\{\mu_N(C_{\alpha,N})\}$. To do this we introduce the following two definitions. Let $\mathcal{A}_r$ be the rooted tree of depth r for which each non-leaf vertex has $\mathbb{N}$ children. For readers unfamiliar with $\mathcal{A}_r$, see Section 3.1.

Definition 1.2.3. A collection of random variables $(V_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_r}$ is said to be in *standard order* if the following is true. The V_n (i.e. the weights of the vertices at the first level) are arranged in decreasing order. The weights corresponding to the children of any vertex α, $V_{\alpha n}$, are arranged in decreasing order.

Let μ_N and ζ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.2.2. Then for any ζ-admissible $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, let $C_{\alpha,N}$ be the corresponding clusters, and set

$$\tilde{Y}_{\alpha,N} = \begin{cases} C_{\alpha,N} & \text{for } \alpha \in \tau_{N,r} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\tau_{N,r}$ is the m_N-regular tree from Definition 1.1.2. Finally, let $(Y_{\alpha,N})_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_r}$ be $(\mu_N(\tilde{Y}_{\alpha,N}))_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_r}$ arranged in standard order. We then have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2.4. *Let (Y_α) be distributed like the weights of a Ruelle Probability Cascade with parameters $\zeta_k = \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1}]$ with $q_0 = 0$ and $q_{r+1} = 1$. Then*

$$(Y_{\alpha,N}) \overset{(d)}{\to} (Y_\alpha).$$

This convergence in distribution is topologized in Section 7. For the reader's convenience, basic facts about Ruelle Probability Cascades are reviewed in the appendix. Alternatively, see [20].

We would like to end this section with a remark regarding the possibility of quantifying these results. At first glance one might expect that the above results are unquantifiable. This, however, is not the case. In Section 10, we demonstrate that if one can obtain a uniform rate of convergence of the probabilities of a particular class of sets (having to do with R^n), then one can obtain an estimate on the rates of convergence of the above. In particular, fix an admissible sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ and let $\zeta_1 = \zeta[0, q_1)$, and let $\mathscr{B}$ be defined by

$$\mathscr{B} = \{E : \exists k : E = \{x_1 \geq q_k + \epsilon, x_2 \geq q_k, x_3 < q_k\}, \text{ or }, \exists k : E = \{x_1 \leq q_k - \epsilon, x_2 \geq q_k, x_3 \geq q_k\}\}.$$

These sets measure the failure of ultrametricity. Furthermore, let $\mathscr{A}(\{q_k\})$ be defined as in Section 4. Roughly speaking, these sets have to do with the probabilities of balls of certain radii. Finally let $D_1(N; \{q_k\})$ and $D_2(N; \{q_k\})$ be such that

$$D_1(N) = \sup_{A\in\mathscr{A}} |P_N(A) - P(A)| \text{ and } D_2(N) = \sup_{B\in\mathscr{B}} |P_N(B) - P(B)|.$$

If we assume that there is a monotone decreasing function $D(N)$ that goes to 0 as $N \to \infty$ such that

$$D(N) \geq D_1(N) \vee D_2(N),$$

then we have the following (probably highly sub-optimal) result.

Theorem 1.2.5. *Let $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ be an admissible sequence with parameters $\zeta_k = \zeta[0, q_k)$. Then there are functions $n_0(N)$, $\nu(N)$, and $m_{**}(N)$ such that μ_N admits a collection $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha \in \tau_{m_{**}(N)}}$ that is $(2^{-\nu+1}, 0)$-hierarchically exhausting and $(1/2^{n_0}, 1/2^{n_0/2})$-hierarchically clustering with probability greater than $1 - 1/2^{\nu(N)}$. Furthermore we have the bounds,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(N) &\geq \Omega(\log\log\log\log(1/D(N))) \\
n_0(N) &\geq \Omega(\log\log\log\log(1/D(N))) \\
m_{**}(N) &\geq \Omega((\log\log\log(1/D(N)))^c),
\end{aligned}$$

where these inequalities are to be understood up to constants that depend on r and ζ_1, and c also depends on these parameters.

We would like to re-iterate that the rates we get are to be viewed as most likely *highly* sub-optimal. We do not try to find the optimal rates as we believe the real issue will be finding $D(N)$. To see why, note that to obtain a uniform rate for the class $\mathscr{B}$ is equivalent to proving the so-called "Strong Ultrametricity" conjecture [28]. Note also that one might instead attempt to obtain a rate of convergence for the limiting overlap distribution as a whole. This should allow one to simultaneously obtain rates for the classes $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$.

A final remark: G. Parisi mentioned in private communication that simulations suggest that the free energy decays like a power law, so it seems reasonable to assume $D(N)$ decays like a power law.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Dmitry Panchenko for lending his insight at the early stages of this project, as well as many helpful correspondences. The author thanks Antonio Auffinger for many helpful discussions and for a very careful reading of an early version of this paper. The author also thanks his Ph.D. advisor Gérard Ben Arous for his support. This research was conducted while the author was supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship DGE-0813964 and NSF Grant DMS 1209165.

2. Applications to Spin Glasses

In this section we describe how to apply the above results to spin glasses. We begin in Section 2.1 with a discussion of how to apply these results to specific models on the hypercube. We then use the results to recover a similar result of Talagrand in Section 2.2. We end by discussing how to use these results to prove two important conjectures in spin glasses in Section 2.3.

2.1. Models on the Hypercube.

In this section we explain how to apply the above results to spin glass models on the hypercube. We begin by explaining how to view spin glass models in this framework and then discuss specific models to which the results apply.

Let $\Sigma_N = \{-1, +1\}^N$ be the N-dimensional hypercube. We focus on Gaussian spin glass models which have the following form. For each N, we have a Hamiltonian $(H_N(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma_N}$ which is a centered Gaussian process indexed by Σ_N with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}H_N(\sigma^1)H_N(\sigma^2) = N\xi(R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)) \tag{2.1.1}$$

where

$$R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^1 \sigma_i^2$$

is called the *overlap*. Corresponding to this sequence of Hamiltonians, is the sequence of Gibbs measures

$$G_N(\sigma) = \frac{e^{-\beta H_N(\sigma)}}{Z_N}$$

where the normalization Z_N is the *partition function.*

To place this in the above framework, view Σ_N as included in ℓ_2 through the natural inclusion map $i : \Sigma_N \hookrightarrow \ell_2$ defined by

$$(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_N) \overset{i}{\mapsto} (\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sigma_1, \ldots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sigma_N, 0, \ldots).$$

Notice that under this inclusion, the overlap becomes the ℓ_2 inner product,

$$R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) = (i(\sigma^1), i(\sigma^2))_{\ell_2}.$$

Furthermore we see that $||i(\sigma)||_2 = 1$, so that $i(\Sigma_N) \subset B_{\ell_2}(0, 1)$. The push-forward of the Gibbs measures through this map $\mu_N = i_* G_N$ is the desired sequence of random measures on the unit ball that are a.s. supported on the unit sphere $\{||\sigma|| = 1\}$.

The arrays R^n from Section 1.1 are then the leading principal minors of the overlap array since

$$\mathbb{E}G_N^{\otimes\infty}((R(\sigma^i, \sigma^j))_{i,j\in[n]} \in \cdot) = \mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(R^n \in \cdot)$$

and similarly ζ_N is the overlap distribution corresponding to G_N

$$\zeta_N(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}G_N^{\otimes 2}(R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \in \cdot).$$

To understand these results, suppose for a moment that we know that $\{\mu_N\}$ satisfies the AGGI's and $\zeta_N \to \zeta$ for some ζ with a non-empty collection of admissible sequences. Then Theorem 1.2.2 tells us that for any ζ- admissible sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, with high probability in the choice of H_N, there is a nontrivial decomposition of the hypercube into clusters which organize by their overlap structure off of which the measure places essentially no mass, as with the pure states described in [16]. Furthermore, Theorem 1.2.4 says that these clusters have masses that approach that of a Ruelle Probability Cascade as with the pure states from the physics literature. Thus we can see the Ruelle Cascade arising at finite N by looking at where the measure places mass.

Remark 2.1.1. One would like to think of these sets as balls on the hypercube in the induced metric from ℓ_2. As is evident from the proof of Theorem 1.2.2, this is quantitatively not far from what is proven.

We now discuss specific models to which our results apply.

Example 2.1.2 (Mixed p-spin glasses)**.** The *mixed p-spin glass* model is the model with Hamiltonian H_N of the above form with covariance structure defined by (2.1.1) where ξ is of the form

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{p\geq 1} \beta_p^2 t^p$$

and is such that $\xi(1+\epsilon) < \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. A mixed p-spin glass model is said to be *generic* if the monomials $\{x^p : \beta_p > 0\}$ are total in $(C[0, 1], ||\cdot||_\infty)$ (see the Müntz-Szaz theorem [13] for a necessary and sufficient condition). It is well-known [20] that for generic models, the corresponding sequence of μ_N satisfy the AGGI's. Furthermore, it is known [25] that the sequence ζ_N has a unique limit point, ζ. It is also known [4] that at low-temperature, that is, β large, ζ has admissible sequences of length at least 2. Our results thus apply to generic models at low temperature.

Remark 2.1.3. It is not known whether or not the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities hold for a larger class of models. Indeed it can be shown that the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model ($p = 2$) with no external field does not satisfy the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities as it violates the Talagrand Positivity Principle (See Section 3.3 for more). That being said, one can prove that for any mixed p model there is a perturbation of the Hamiltonian that does not change the free energy such that the perturbed model has the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities [28, 20]. It is not known if the overlap distribution converges in a more general setting.

Example 2.1.4 (REM)**.** The Random Energy Model (REM) [10] is the model with covariance structure of the form (2.1.1) where ξ is given by

$$\xi(t) = \mathbb{1}_{t=1}.$$

It is known that for the REM, the measures μ_N satisfy the AGGIs [7] and that the ζ_N weakly converge to

$$\zeta = (1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_c})\delta_0 + \frac{\beta}{\beta_c}\delta_1$$

for $\beta > \beta_c$ where $\beta_c = \sqrt{2\log 2}$ [6]. Thus our results apply to the REM. In particular they give a decomposition with precisely one level (here the only admissible sequences consist of a single point $q \in (0,1)$). It has been shown that at low temperature, the Gibbs measure converges as a point process to a Ruelle Cascade [6]. Our results give a new proof of this, as well as showing how the cascade can be seen to be occurring qualitatively at finite N.

Example 2.1.5 (GREM)**.** The Generalized Random Energy model (GREM) [11] has a slightly non-standard covariance structure. Fix an $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and sequences

$$0 = q_0 < q_1 < \ldots < q_r \leq 1 \text{ and } 0 = \zeta_{-1} < \ldots < \zeta_{r+1} = 1.$$

Let $\log(\alpha_i^N) = N(q_{i+1} - q_i)\log(2)$ and let

$$\xi(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) = \sum_{k \leq r} (\zeta_{k+1} - \zeta_k)\mathbb{1}_{(\sigma^1(k), \sigma^2(k))=1},$$

where $\sigma(k)$ is the vector with the same first $N\sum i \leq k \lg(\alpha_i^N)$ components as σ and has the remaining coordinates set to 0. The GREM is the model whose covariance is of the form

$$\mathbb{E}H_N(\sigma^1)H_N(\sigma^2) = N\xi(\sigma^1, \sigma^2).$$

It is known that the sequence ζ_N converges to ζ such that

$$\zeta\{q_k\} = \zeta_{k+1} - \zeta_k$$

at sufficiently low temperature. (See [6, Chapter 10] for the relevant temperature ranges.) It is also known that the sequence of μ_N corresponding to the GREM has the Ghirlanda-Guerra property [6, 7, 8]. Our results then apply to the GREM at low-temperature. In particular, they tell us that at sufficiently low temperature the admissible sequences can be taken to be any sequence that interlaces the above q_k. Taking a sequence that is arbitrarily close to the q_k then shows us how the Ruelle Cascade predicted in [11] and [23] appears at finite N as we get clusters of sets that are effectively balls on which most of the mass is supported that are indexed by the m_N-regular rooted tree of depth r whose masses are close, in law, to those of an RPC. In particular, as with the REM, our results provide a new proof of convergence to an RPC, as well as providing a sense in which this structure arises at finite N at low temperature.

There are many other models which are expected to satisfy the AGGIs. In particular, it is known after using a perturbation as with the mixed p models for the Diluted SK model [21], the Random K-SAT model [18], and the Edwards-Anderson model [9] to name a few. To our knowledge, it is not yet known in any of these models if the overlap distribution converges.

2.2. **A new proof of Talagrand's pure state construction.** We now discuss how to use our results to recover a result of Talagrand on the existence of approximate pure states. Until now, the best answer to the question of the existence of approximate pure states at finite particle number was [27, Theorem 2.4]. Talagrand showed that under certain conditions on the overlap distribution there are sets inside the support of the Gibbs measure such within any given set, the overlap between two configurations is almost q_*, the supremum of the support of the overlap distribution, on average. Furthermore, these sets are disjoint, exhaust the measure in the limit, and have masses which converge in distribution to a Poisson-Dirichlet process.

The clusters from the above should be compared with these sets. As a consequence of the proofs of Theorem 1.2.2 and Theorem 1.2.4, with minor modifications, one can recover the existence of these sets up to a small correction. Furthermore, if there are admissible sequences of length at least two, one gains additional information about the distance between the sets in the sense of Theorem 1.2.2 and Theorem 1.2.4. We state this as a corollary.

Corollary 2.2.1. *Let μ_N be as above. Assume that ζ is supported on $[0, q_*]$ and that $\zeta\{q_*\} > 0$. Then there is a sequence of random sets $A_{k,N} \subset \Sigma_N$ such that $\mu_N(A_{k,N})$ converge in distribution*

to the points of a $PD(1-\zeta(\{q_*\}))$ *and such that for any* ϵ *positive, there exists an* N_0 *such that for* $N > N_0$*,*

$$\int_{A_{k,N}\times A_{k,N}} |R_{12} - q_*| d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} < \epsilon \mu_N(A_{k,N})^2 + o(1) \tag{2.2.1}$$

for all k*, with probability at least* $1-\epsilon$*. Furthermore, for all* ϵ *positive and* $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$*, there is an* N_0 *such that for* $N > N_0$ *the expression* (2.2.1) *holds without the* $o(1)$ *correction for those* $k \leq k_0$*. Finally, these* $A_{k,N}$ *are the mass-rearranged leaves of a random sequence of sets* $A'_{\alpha,N}$ *whose masses converge to an RPC with parameters* $\zeta_k = \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1})$ *where* $q_r = q_*$*.*

Here $PD(\theta)$ is the Poisson-Dirichlet Process [20]. In terms of the two-parameter PD process, this is $PD(\theta, 0)$.

This is to be compared with the result of Talagrand where he obtains sets as above where (2.2.1) holds without the $o(1)$ correction for all k. In exchange for price of the $o(1)$ correction, however, we get additional structure. If $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ is ζ-admissible and r is at least two, then these sets are the leaves of a collection of sets $\{A_{\alpha,N}\}_{\mathcal{A}_{r+1}}$ that hierarchically cluster and the masses of this latter sequence of sets converges to an RPC.

2.3. **Talagrand's Orthogonal Structures Conjecture and The Dotsenko-Franz-Mézard Conjecture.** We now discuss how to use the above techniques to prove two conjectures regarding mixed p-spin glass models on the hypercube. In [26], Talagrand conjectured that the support of the Gibbs measure at low temperature admits a special decomposition which he called an "Orthogonal Structure"

Definition 2.3.1. A spin glass model on the hypercube with corresponding Gibbs measures G_N is said to admit an *Orthogonal Structure* if there is a sequence $(a_k)_{k\geq 0}$ with $a_k > 0$ such that for any $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and ϵ positive, there is an N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$, with probability at least $3/4$, there is a random collection of sets $\{A_{k,N}\}_{k\leq k_0} \subset \Sigma_N$ such that

$$G_N(A_{k,N}) \geq a_k$$

and on these sets, the points in different sets are almost orthogonal in an L_1 sense: for each $k, l \leq k_0$ with $k \neq l$

$$\left\langle |R_{12}| \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in A_{k,N}, \sigma^2 \in A_{l,N}} \right\rangle < \epsilon.$$

He then conjectured that at zero external field, mixed p-spin glass models admit orthogonal structures.

Conjecture 2.3.2 (Orthogonal Structures Conjecture)**.** *The Gibbs measures for a mixed p-spin glass model with* 0 *external field admit an Orthogonal Structure.*

As an illustration of the use of approximate ultrametricity, we prove this conjecture for generic models.

Theorem 2.3.3 (Orthogonal Structures Conjecture)**.** *For a generic mixed p-spin glass model,* $\zeta(\{0\}) > 0$ *if and only if Gibbs measures* G_N *admit an Orthogonal Structure.*

Remark 2.3.4. In fact our proof shows that any sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ that satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.2.2 and has $\zeta(\{0\}) > 0$ admits an Orthogonal structure except with the random sets as subsets of the unit ball of ℓ_2 rather than the hypercube.

We prove this result in the "Replica Symmetry Breaking" regime, that is $\zeta(\{0\}) < 1$, which follows from Approximate ultrametricity of the sequence μ_N with respect to ζ. This is proven in Theorem 8.0.10. That the result holds in the "Replica Symmetric" regime $\zeta(\{0\}) = 1$, and that an atom at zero is necessary both immediately follow Markov's inequality and weak convergence, so their proofs are omitted.

In [26], Talagrand explored a conjecture of Dotsenko, Franz, and Mézard, that for the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model without external field, for all negative exponents a,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{aN} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N^a = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N$$

where Z_N is the partition function [12]. Talagrand showed that this conjecture holds for generic mixed p-spin glass models provided the Orthogonal Structures conjecture holds. Using Talagrand's result and the above, we find that the Dotsenko-Franz-Mézard conjecture holds in this regime for generic mixed p-spin glass models.

Corollary 2.3.5 (Dotsenko-Franz-Mézard conjecture)**.** *Suppose Z_N is the partition function for a generic mixed p-spin glass Hamiltonian such that $\zeta(\{0\}) > 0$, then for all a negative*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{aN} \log \mathbb{E} Z_N^a = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log Z_N.$$

2.4. **Organization of Document.** The remainder of this document is organized as follows. In Section 3, we introduce the necessary preliminaries to understand the outline of the proofs of Theorem 1.2.2 and Theorem 1.2.4. We outline these proofs in Section 3.4. In Sections 4-7 we prove these results. In Section 8 we prove the Orthogonal Structures conjecture in the Replica Symmetry Breaking regime. In Section 9 we prove Corollary 2.2.1. In Section 10 we discuss quantifying the above results. We end the document with the Appendix which contains miscellaneous results of relevance to the paper.

3. Preliminaries

3.1. **Some notation regarding trees.** In the following, we will be frequently working with rooted trees. We designate the root by $\emptyset$. $p(\alpha)$ denotes is the root-vertex path of α. We denote the least common ancestor of α and β by $\alpha \wedge \beta$. For a tree τ, we let $\partial\tau$ denote its leaves and let $|\tau|$ denote its cardinality.

In the subsequent, we work with rooted trees of a particular form. Let $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^r$ be a collection of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and let $E_0 = \{\emptyset\}$. We think of

$$\bigcup_{k\le r} E_1 \times \ldots \times E_k$$

as a tree as follows. The vertices at depth k correspond to k-tuples in $E_1 \times \ldots \times E_k$, where the coordinates sequentially describe the path from the root to the vertex (omitting the root). We will be most interested in the case $E_k = \mathbb{N}$ for all k. We denote this space by $\mathcal{A}_r = \cup_{k\le r}\mathbb{N}^k$. As an example of this notation, take the tree $\mathcal{A}_3$. Then $\alpha = (1, 2)$ corresponds to the second child of the first child of the root. We define *shaped* trees.

Definition 3.1.1. Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(m_1, \ldots, m_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$. The $(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$-*shaped tree* is the tree

$$\tau = \bigcup_{k\le r} [m_1] \times \ldots \times [m_k].$$

we denote the shape of a tree by $shape(\tau)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_r$ denote the space of all $(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ shaped trees for all $(m_1, \ldots, m_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$ (in particular, $m_i < \infty$). We call $\mathcal{T}_r$ the space of finitely shaped trees of depth r.

We think of τ with shape $(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$ as included in $\mathcal{A}_r$ through the natural set inclusion. Similarly define τ^i to be the (shifted) tree obtained by adding $i \cdot m_1$ to the first coordinate of every (non-root) vertex in τ, where τ^1 is just τ as above. We also view τ^i as included in $\mathcal{A}_r$ in the natural way. By τ_m we always mean the $(m, \ldots, m)$-shaped tree.

Once we have tree shapes we also want to study a pruning of the infinite tree $\mathcal{A}_r$ into the shape defined by a $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_r$.

Definition 3.1.2. Fix a $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_r$ with shape $(m_1, \ldots, m_r)$. A τ-*pruning of* $\mathcal{A}_r$ is the (infinite) subtree we get by organizing the children at level 1 into groups of cardinality m_1 (here we have not modified the tree), and to each of those children we only consider the first m_2 children. At level $k \ge 2$ keep only the first m_k children.

3.2. **Some properties of Ultrametric Spaces.** For the following work we need to abstract properties of ultrametric spaces. We will focus on two properties of collections of balls, one is measure theoretic and the other is geometric measure theoretic.

Recall that balls in ultrametric spaces have special inclusion properties. If we fix two balls of radius at most r, then either they are disjoint or one is contained in the other. In particular a decreasing sequence of radii corresponds to a partition of space into balls that are hierarchically arranged. To be precise, one can index these balls by a rooted tree in such a way that the balls of parents contains those of their children and balls of cousins are disjoint.

If a metric space is "almost" ultrametric, we might expect to have balls in the support that "almost" behave this way. We might expect to find a sequence of balls that "almost" exhaust the measure and are uniformly "almost" disjoint. To make this idea precise we introduce the idea of *hierarchical exhaustions*.

Definition 3.2.1. Fix r and a $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_r$. A collection of sets $\{B_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\tau}$ is said to be an (ϵ,δ)-*hierarchical exhaustion* of $\mu \in \Pr(B_{\ell_2}(0,1))$ if:

(1) The sets are hierarchically arranged by inclusion:
$$B_\alpha \subset B_\beta \text{ if } \beta \precsim \alpha.$$

(2) The sets corresponding to cousins have uniformly small intersections:
$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha,\beta\in\tau\\ \alpha\nsim\beta}} \mu(B_\alpha \cap B_\beta) \leq \delta.$$

(3) The sets almost exhaust the measure at every depth: for each $k \in [r]$,
$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \mu(B_\alpha) \geq 1-\epsilon.$$

(4) The sets corresponding to children exhaust the sets corresponding to parents: for $\alpha \in \tau \setminus \partial\tau$
$$\mu(B_\alpha) - \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} \mu(B_\beta) \in [0,\epsilon).$$

Remark 3.2.2. We would like to point out that there is no implication between (3) and (4). Observe that (3) does not imply (4) as it does not provide control on the intersections. By the same token, (4) does not imply (3) as it provides no control on the number of children.

We invite the reader to compare this with (1)-(3) in Definition 1.1.2.

Another consequence of ultrametricity is that if we take two points in the same ball of radius r then their distance is at most r. Similarly, if we take two balls, B_1 and B_2 of radius r whose centers are $r+\epsilon$-separated and two points $x_1 \in B_1$ and $x_2 \in B_2$, then x_1 and x_2 are at least $r+\epsilon$ separated. This is to be contrasted with the setting of regular metric spaces where both inequalities are off by an additive factor of r and $-r$ respectively.

Again for an "almost ultrametric" space, we may not be able to see such a precise structure as it may happen that the sets seen above have centers that are too close or have non-trivial intersections. Instead we might hope that the distances between points as above at least behave like the distances to the centers of the balls with high probability. To make this precise we introduce the notion of *hierarchical clustering*

Definition 3.2.3. Fix r, a $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_r$, and $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$. A collection of sets $\{C_\alpha\}_\alpha$ is said to be an (ϵ,δ)-*hierarchical clustering* for a measure μ with respect to the sequence $\{r_k\}$ if

(1) Points are uniformly close within clusters: for every α in τ_{m_N},
$$\mu_N\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2 \in C_{\alpha,N} : (\sigma^1,\sigma^2) \leq q_{|\alpha|} - \epsilon\right) \leq \delta. \tag{3.2.1}$$

(2) Points in cousins are uniformly far: for every $\alpha \nsim \beta$ in τ_{m_N}, if $\gamma \prec \alpha$ is such that $|\gamma| = |\alpha\wedge\beta|+1$ and similarly for η and β, then
$$\mu_N\left(\sigma^1 \in C_\gamma, \sigma^2 \in C_\eta : (\sigma^1,\sigma^2) \geq q_{|\gamma\wedge\eta|+1} + \epsilon\right) \leq \delta. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Using this language, we restate the definition of approximately ultrametricity as a sequence of measures that admit sets that are increasingly exhausting and clustering with high probability.

Definition. A sequence $\{\mu_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ of random measures on the unit ball of ℓ_2 such that is said to be *approximately ultrametric with respect to* ζ if for every ζ-admissible sequence, $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^{r}$, there is a sequence of finite rooted trees of depth r, $\{\tau_N\}$, and sequences a_N, b_N, and ϵ_N all tending to 0 such that with probability tending to one, there are sets $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha\in\tau_N}$ such that they are an $(\epsilon_N, 0)$-hierarchically exhaustion of μ_N and are (a_N, b_N)-hierarchically clustering for μ_N with respect to the sequence $\{(q_k)\}$.

The $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}$ in the above definition are to be directly compared with the pure states of physicists [16]. Recall that these "pure states" arrange hierarchically into the equivalence classes of replica (i.i.d. draws)

$$\sigma^1 \sim \sigma^2 \iff (\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \geq q_k.$$

In the language above, this is the partitioning property of ultrametric spaces. We cannot expect such overlap based equivalence classes to form at finite N as can be seen by constructing a sequence of overlap distributions that are almost RPC's at large but finite N but fail to satisfy this clustering. This is due to the issue mentioned before, namely there can be points in C_α that are so close to those in C_β that their balls cut in to both sets. Instead we get that on average such a clustering happens and that such exceptional points become increasingly rare in the limit.

3.3. **Dovbysh-Sudakov measures and Consequences of the Ghirlanda-Guerra Property.** The key element of the following analysis is that the sequence of measures satisfies the Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra identities. We briefly summarize the structure theory of such sequences. For a more in-depth survey see [20, 17].

We begin with the following definitions. Fix μ a random probability measure on the unit ball of ℓ_2. Draw (σ^i) iid from μ and form the doubly infinite array of pairwise inner products

$$R = (R_{ij})_{i,j,\geq 1}\,.$$

We call the pair (R, μ) a *ROSt* [2]. We call the array R the *Gram-DeFinetti* array and μ the *Dovbysh-Sudakov measure* of the ROSt. The array R is *weak exchangeable*, that is, if π is a permutation of $\mathbb{N}$, then

$$(R_{ij}) \overset{(d)}{=} (R_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}).$$

In general, we call a random doubly infinite array whose minors are positive semi-definite a *Gram-DeFinetti* array. An important property of ROSts is contained in the Dovbysh-Sudakov theorem which we state in a simplified form.

Proposition (Dovbysh-Sudakov)**.** *For any Gram-DeFinetti array R such that $|R_{ij}| \leq 1$, there is a ROSt $(\tilde{R}, \mu)$ and a random probability measure ν on $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that if a_i are iid drawn from ν, then*

$$(R_{ij}) \overset{(d)}{=} (\tilde{R}_{ij} + a_i\delta_{ij}).$$

Let μ_N be a sequence of random probability measures on the unit ball of ℓ_2 that satisfy the AGGI's. Denote the laws of the Gram-DeFinetti arrays by P_N. By compactness, there is a P such that $P_N \to P$ weakly and such that P is the law of a Gram-DeFinetti array. Let (R, μ) be the ROSt corresponding to P given by the Dovbysh-Sudakov theorem. In the case that $\{\mu_N\}$ arises from a sequence of Gibbs measures as in Section 2, we call this μ the *limiting Dovbysh-Sudakov measure* of the sequence $\{\mu_N\}$. This is precisely the Asymptotic Gibbs Measure of Panchenko. The Dovbysh-Sudakov Measure μ must satisfy the *Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities*: for all n, bounded Borel f, and continuous ψ

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\psi(R_{1,n+1})\right\rangle = \frac{1}{n}\left(\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\right\rangle \mathbb{E}\left\langle \psi(R_{12})\right\rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\psi(R_{1,k})\right\rangle\right)$$

where R^n is the n-th minor of R. Measures that satisfy the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities have the following properties.

Proposition 3.3.1. [20] *Let μ satisfy the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities. Then:*

- *The measure is concentrated on a sphere: if q_* is the supremum of the support of ζ the overlap distribution for μ, then $\mu(||\sigma|| = q_*) = 1$ almost surely.*

- *Talagrand's Positivity Principle:* $\mu^{\otimes 2}(R_{12} \in [-1, 0)) = 0$ *almost surely.*
- *Panchenko's Ultrametricity Theorem: the support of* μ *is almost surely ultrametric. That is,*
$$\mathbb{E}\mu^{\otimes 3}(R_{12} \leq R_{13} \wedge R_{23}) = 0$$
- *Baffiano-Rosati theorem: the law of* μ *is uniquely specified by its overlap distribution (modulo partial isometries of separable Hilbert space).*

We end this section with the following well-known consequence of the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities. (See [20, Section 2.4], particularly the discussion regarding the κ approximation to R, and [18].) By a q-ball, we mean a set of the form $\{\sigma \in B(0,1) : (\sigma, \sigma_0) \geq q\}$ for some σ_0

Fact 3.3.2. *Let* μ *satisfy the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities. Let* $\zeta(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}\mu^{\otimes 2}((\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \in \cdot)$*. Let* $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ *be* ζ*-admissible. Partition the support of* μ *as follows. Let* B_n *be a sequence of* q_1*-balls that partition the support of* μ*. Let* $B_{\alpha n}$ *be* $q_{|\alpha|}$*-balls such that* $B_\alpha = \cup_n B_{\alpha n}$*. Finally , let* V_α *be the* μ*-masses of these balls arranged in standard order. The law of these weights is distributed like those of an RPC with the overlap distribution with parameters* $\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1} = \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1})$*. In particular, there are infinitely many of them at each level and they have almost surely non-zero weights.*

Fact 3.3.2 is well-known in the literature (see for example [18]), however to our knowledge a proof has never been published, so for the convenience of the reader we prove this in the Appendix.

3.4. **Outline of Proofs of Main Results.** In this section we outline the strategy of the proofs of Theorem 1.2.2 and Theorem 1.2.4. Before we start, we fix some notation. Fix a sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.2.2. Let $\{P_N\}$ denote the corresponding sequence of laws of the Gram-DeFinetti arrays corresponding to μ_N. Since $\zeta_N \to \zeta$ weakly by assumption (see Theorem 1.2.2 for this notation), and μ_N satisfies the AGGIs, it follows from the Baffiano-Rosati theorem (see Proposition 3.3.1) that there is a unique P corresponding to a Gram-DeFinetti array such that $P_N \to P$ weakly. Let μ be the Dovbysh-Sudakov measure corresponding to P. After possibly enlarging the background probability space, we couple this sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ with μ and we take them all to be living on a single space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ which we call *the background space of disorder.*

We begin first with the proof of Theorem 1.2.2. We begin the proof in Section 4 by showing that if we sample random balls in the support of μ_N, then the collection of their masses converges in law to those corresponding to balls drawn from μ. We make this precise as follows

Draw $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_r}$ i.i.d from μ_N and consider the collection of sets $\{B_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_r}$ with

$$B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \bigcap_{\beta \prec \alpha} B(\sigma^\beta, q_{|\beta|}), \tag{3.4.1}$$

where

$$B(\sigma, q) = \{x \in B_{\ell_2}(0,1) : (\sigma, x) \geq q\}.$$

(Since we only consider its intersection with a sphere, we call it a q-ball.) That is, it is the intersection of the $q_{|\alpha|}$-ball of σ^α with the corresponding balls of its ancestors.

Let F_2^r denote the set of subsets of vertices in $\mathcal{A}_r$ of size at most 2. Consider the following set of weights

$$(W_{E,N})_{E \in F_2^r} = \left\{ \mu_N \left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in E} B_\alpha \right) \right\}_{E \in F_2^r} \tag{3.4.2}$$

which is a sequence $\mathbf{W}_N$ of random variables taking values in $[0,1]^{F_2^r}$. We denote their laws by Q_N. We define $\mathbf{W}$ similarly for μ the Dovbysh-Sudakov measure, and denote the corresponding law Q. This sampling structure is intended to mimic the hierarchical structure of the RPC while also storing additional data about intersections of relevant balls. Then we have:

Lemma 3.4.1. *Fix a* ζ*-admissible sequence* $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$*. The sequence* $\mathbf{W}_N$ *defined in* (3.4.2) *converges to* $\mathbf{W} = (W_E)_{E \in F_2^r}$ *in distribution.*

The next step in the proof, in Section 5, is to show that there are B_α as above in the support of μ_N that define an (ϵ, δ)-hierarchical exhaustion.

Proposition 3.4.2. *For every r and ζ-admissible sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, we have that for every ϵ, δ positive,*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\exists \tau_{N,r} \in \mathcal{T}_r : &\exists a\ (\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{|\tau_{N,r}|^2}) - \textit{hierarchical exhaustion of } \mu_N) = \\ &\mathbb{P}(\exists \tau_{N,r} \in \mathcal{T}_r : \exists a\ (\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{|\tau_{N,r}|^2}) - \textit{hierarchical exhaustion of } \mu) = 1\end{aligned} \tag{3.4.3}$$

We then "clean" up the above sets by removing intersections so that we can take $\delta = 0$ in the above. In particular, we have:

Corollary 3.4.3. *For every ϵ positive, r and ζ-admissible sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\exists \tau_{N,r} : \exists(\epsilon, 0) - \textit{exhaustion of } \mu_N) = 1.$$

In Section 5.4, we regularize $\tau_{N,r}$, by showing that for N large enough, we can take $\tau_{N,r}$ is of the form $\tau_{m,r}$ for some m (recall this notation from Section 3.1).

In Section 6, we show that we can take the above sets to be hierarchically clustering with high probability. This will follow from Panchenko's Ultrametricity theorem (Proposition 3.3.1). We combine these results in Theorem 6.2.2 to show that the sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ admits an increasingly more exhausting and clustering sequence of clusters. As this applies to any admissible sequence, this concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2.2

The proof of Theorem 1.2.4 follows in two steps. First, we show that the collection of masses corresponding to the leaves, rearranged by mass converges to a Poisson-Dirichlet process (see Theorem 6.3.5). This follows from a standard application of Talagrand's Identities for the Poisson-Dirichlet process, after making an observation about approximation the indicator functions of sets in a clustering by functions of the overlap. (See [24, 20, 3] for explanations and examples of the former technique.)

We then introduce the space of cascade of depth r of which the collection of masses (Y_α^N) are an element for each N. We present an encoding of a cascade into a ROSt and show that for the distributional limits of a sequence of cascades, the corresponding sequence of ROSts must also converge. We then characterize the limit of the sequence of ROSts corresponding to the (Y_α^N) and find that the limit object is unique and is given by an RPC. We then use this to conclude that the sequence of masses converge in distribution to a unique limit that is given by the weights of an RPC. (This argument is to be compared with the convergence of structural distributions for mass partitions in [5].)

4. Weak Convergence of the ball weights

For the rest of this paper, we work with a fixed r and suppress the notation in r. In this section, we prove the weak convergence of the weights described in (3.4.2). using the method of moments. The main observation is that computing the moments of W_E is equivalent to computing probabilities of certain events regarding replica overlaps.

We begin with the following observation. Since F_2^r is countable, the product space $\left([0,1]^{F_2}, \tau_{prod}\right)$ is compact Hausdorff. Consider the measurable space $\left([0,1]^{F_2}, \mathcal{B}\right)$ where $\mathcal{B}$ is the Borel σ-algebra for the product topology. A standard argument then gives that moments are convergence determining class. The proof is an application of Stone-Weierstrass so it is omitted.

Lemma 4.0.4. *Then a sequence of measures $\nu_N \in \mathscr{M}([0,1]^{F_2}, \mathcal{B})$ converges weakly to ν iff for all finite subsets $E \subset F_2$, and (finite) sequences $\{n_B\}_{B\in E} \subset \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\int \prod_{B\in E} \pi_B(x)^{n_B} d\nu_N \to \int \prod_{B\in E} \pi_B(x)^{n_B} d\nu.$$

Now consider the class of sets $\mathscr{A}$ defined as follows. Choose M, n finite, a collection of sets $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^M \subset F_2$, and a partition $\cup_{k=1}^M I_k = [n]$ such that $|I_k| = n_k$. Let

$$J = \{(\beta, j, l) : j \in I_l, \beta \precsim \alpha, \alpha \in E_l, l \le M\}$$

and consider the sets

$$A = \bigcap_{(\beta,j,l)\in J} \left\{ R(\sigma^\beta, \tilde{\sigma}^j) \geq q_{|\beta|} \right\}. \tag{4.0.4}$$

with ζ-admissible $\{q_k\}$. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{A \text{ of the form (4.0.4)}\}$. We then have the following lemma whose proof, we omit as it follows immediately from the definition of admissible sequences.

Lemma 4.0.5. *The elements of $\mathscr{A}$ are P-continuity sets.*

The proof of Lemma 3.4.1 can now be completed. We restate it for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma (3.4.1)**.** *For every r and ζ-admissible $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, the sequence W_N converges to W in law.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.0.4, it suffices to show convergence of joint moments

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{k=1}^{M} W_{E_k,N}^{n_k} \to \mathbb{E} \prod W_{E_k}^{n_k}.$$

If we let $\cup I_k$ and J be as above and let $(\tilde{\sigma}_N^i)$ be drawn i.i.d. from μ_N,

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{k=1}^{M} W_{E_k,N}^{n_k} = \mathbb{E} \left\langle \prod_{k\leq M} \mu_N \left(\bigcap_{\alpha\in E_k} B_\alpha \right)^{n_k} \right\rangle = \mathbb{E} \left\langle \prod_{(\beta,j,l)\in J} \mathbb{1}_{R(\sigma^\beta,\tilde{\sigma}^j)\geq q_{|\beta|}} \right\rangle = P_N(A)$$

for some $A \in \mathscr{A}$. By Lemma 4.0.5, it then follows that

$$P_N(A) \to P(A) = \mathbb{E} \prod W_{E_k}^{n_k}$$

as desired. □

5. Exhausting sets

In this section, we prove the (high probability) existence of hierarchical exhaustions for the sequence of μ_N. We begin the section with some measure theoretic preliminaries, and prove the main technical lemmas. We then prove the existence of the exhaustions, and we conclude with some results on the regularity of these exhaustions.

5.1. **Some measure theoretic preliminaries.** Recall the definition of $\mathbf{W}(\omega)$ from (3.4.2). If we view the pair $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mu)$ through the map $\omega \mapsto (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\omega), \mu(\omega))$, and similarly for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N, \mu_N)$, and we consider the map

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\sigma, \mu) = (\mu(\bigcap_{\alpha\in E} B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))_{E\in F_2},$$

then $\mathbf{W}(\omega) = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\omega), \mu(\omega))$. That the relevant maps are measurable can be seen by a monotone class argument.

We now define events that are related to the existence of hierarchical exhaustions. On the space $[0,1]^{F_2}$, we define for every finitely shaped tree τ, and ϵ and δ positive the open sets

$$A_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta} = \bigcap_{k=1}^{r} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|=k \\ \alpha\in\tau}} x_{\{\alpha\}} > 1-\epsilon \right\} \bigcap_{\alpha\in\tau\setminus\partial\tau} \left\{ x_{\{\alpha\}} - \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} x_{\{\beta\}} \in (0,\epsilon) \right\} \bigcap \left\{ 0 \leq \sum_{\substack{\alpha\sim\beta \\ \alpha\beta\in\tau}} x_{\alpha,\beta} < \delta/|\tau|^2 \right\}. \tag{5.1.1}$$

That these sets are open subsets of $[0,1]^{F_2}$ as can be seen from the fact that $|\tau| < \infty$ (note that in the last set you should consider the relevant map as going into $\mathbb{R}_+$ so that $[0, \delta/|\tau|^2)$ is open.

Pulling back through the above maps, we get

$$E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\nu) = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\cdot, \nu) \right)^{-1} (A_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}) \tag{5.1.2}$$

which is a subset of $B_{\ell_2}(0,1)^{\mathcal{A}_r}$ for any measure ν and

$$\tilde{E}_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{W}^{-1}\left(A_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}\right) \tag{5.1.3}$$

which is a subset of the background space of disorder Ω. We define $\tilde{E}^N_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}$ similarly with $\mathbf{W}_N$. By the same token, we define $A_{\tau^i,\epsilon,\delta}$ and its pull-backs using τ^i (recall this notation from Section 3.1). Let

$$A_{\epsilon,\delta} = \bigcup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_r}\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A^i_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}, \tag{5.1.4}$$

which is also an open subset of $[0,1]^{F_2}$ and define $E_{\epsilon,\delta}\left(\mu_N\right)$ and $\tilde{E}^N_{\epsilon,\delta}$ analogously.

Notice that by definition, for any ϵ,δ positive, finitely shaped τ and random probability measure ν, the set

$$E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\nu) \subset \left\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B_{\ell_2}(0,1) : (B_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\tau} \text{ is an } (\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{|\tau|^2}) - \text{hierarchical exhaustion of } \nu\right\}$$

so that if we union over $\tau's$,

$$E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\nu) \subset \left\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \exists\tau\in\mathcal{T}_r, i\in\mathbb{N} : (B_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\tau^i} \text{ is an } (\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{|\tau|^2}) - \text{hierarchical exhaustion of } \nu\right\}.$$

Thus if we can show, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_{\epsilon,\delta}) = 1$, then we know that almost surely there is an $(\epsilon, \delta/|\tau|^2)$-hierarchical exhaustion of μ for some finitely shaped τ.

We conclude this section with the following observation which follows immediately from measure disintegration [14].

Lemma 5.1.1. *We have that*

$$Q(A_{\epsilon,\delta}) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{E}_{\epsilon,\delta}) = \mathbb{E}\mu^{\otimes\infty}\left(E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)\right).$$

5.2. **Technical lemmas.** We remind the reader that μ is the Dovbysh-Sudakov measure for P the limit of the sequence P_N. In the following sections we fix a ζ-admissible sequence $\{q_k\}$. We prove quantitative versions of many of these lemmas in Section 10.

Lemma 5.2.1. *Let μ be as in Section 3.4. Then $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.there is a shaped tree τ such that ,*

$$\mu^{\otimes\mathcal{A}_r}\left(E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)\right) > 0.$$

Proof. Draw μ. By Fact 3.3.2, we know that corresponding to the admissible sequence $\{q_k\}$, there is a nested sequence of balls and weights (U_α, v_α) with

$$\mu(U_\alpha) = v_\alpha > 0$$

a.s. where U_α has radius $q_{|\alpha|}$.

Observe that $E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu) \supset E_{\tau,\epsilon,0}(\mu)$, where by $\delta = 0$ we mean that the last summand in (5.1.1) is 0. It then suffices to show that for some $\tau = \tau(\mu)$ the latter set has positive μ-mass. We choose $\tau \subset \mathcal{A}_r$ as follows.

Pick the smallest m_1 so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_1} v_k > 1-\epsilon.$$

For each $|\alpha| = 1$ such that $\alpha \le m_1$, let m_α be the smallest m such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_\alpha} v_{\alpha k} \ge v_\alpha - \epsilon$$

and let $\tilde{m}_2 = \max m_\alpha$. Let

$$m_2 = \min\{m \ge \tilde{m}_2 : \sum_{k\le m_1}\sum_{n=1}^{m} v_{kn} > 1-\epsilon\}.$$

Construct m_k similarly for $k \in \{3, \dots, r\}$. Let τ be the $(m_1, \dots, m_r)$-shaped tree.

Notice that

$$\mu^{\otimes \mathcal{A}_r}(E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) \geq \mu^{\otimes \mathcal{A}_r}(E_{\tau,\epsilon,0}(\mu)) \geq \prod_{\alpha \in \tau} v_\alpha > 0. \tag{5.2.1}$$

where the second inequality comes from noting that this is the chance that σ^α lands in the U_α. □

Lemma 5.2.2. *We have*

$$\mu^{\otimes \mathcal{A}_r}\left(E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)\right) = 1$$

$\mathbb{P}$-*a.s.*

Proof. Draw μ and define τ as in Lemma 5.2.1. Form the τ-pruning of $\mathcal{A}_r$ which we denote by $(\sigma^{\tau^i})_{i=1}^\infty$ where we abuse notation and let $\sigma^\tau = (\sigma_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \tau}$.

Denote by $\pi E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}$ the projection of $E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)$ on to the coordinates indexed by τ. Note that $E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu) = \pi E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta} \times B(0,1)^{\mathcal{A}_r \setminus \tau}$, interpreting the product suitably. Let $\mathcal{E}_n$ be the empirical measure

$$\mathcal{E}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\sigma^{\tau^i}}$$

which is a measure on $B(0,1)^\tau$. By the Law of Large Numbers applied conditionally on μ,

$$\lim \mathcal{E}_n(\pi E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) = \mu^{\otimes \tau}(\pi E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}) > 0$$

a.s.. As a consequence μ-a.s. there is an I such that $\sigma^{\tau^I} \in \pi E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)$, so that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \cup E_{\tau^i,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)$ μ-a.s.. Thus the first equality holds. The second equality holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. by set containment. □

5.3. **Hierarchical Exhaustion: Proofs.** In this section we prove Proposition 3.4.2 and Corollary 3.4.3. For the convenience of the reader, we restate these results in the above language.

Proposition (3.4.2)**.** *We have that for every ϵ, δ positive,*

$$\lim Q_N(A_{\epsilon,\delta}) = Q(A_{\epsilon,\delta}) = 1.$$

Proof. Since $A_{\epsilon,\delta}$ is open, it follows by weak convergence of Q_N, the law of the collection $(W_{E,N})_{E \in F_2}$, that

$$1 \geq \liminf Q_N(A_{\epsilon,\delta}) \geq Q(A_{\epsilon,\delta}).$$

By Lemma 5.1.1 and Lemma 5.2.2, $Q(A_{\epsilon,\delta}) = 1$. □

Corollary (3.4.3)**.** *For every ϵ positive, we have that*

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\exists(\epsilon, 0) - \textit{exhaustion of } \mu_N) = 1.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.4.2, we know that for $\delta = \epsilon/2$ and for every choice of $\eta > 0$,

$$Q_N(A_{\epsilon/2,\epsilon/2}) \geq 1 - \eta$$

for N large enough. This means that there is a τ and a collection of sets $\{B_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \tau}$ as per (3.4.1) with

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \mu_N(B_\alpha) \geq 1 - \epsilon/2 \text{ and } \sum_{\alpha \nsim \beta} \mu_N\left(B_\alpha \cap B_\beta\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2|\tau|^2}$$

such that

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq \mu_N(B_\alpha) - \sum_{\beta \in child(\alpha)} \mu_N(B_\beta).$$

Using B_α we construct C_α given by

$$C_\alpha = B_\alpha \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\beta \nsim \alpha} B_\beta \right).$$

The C_α's have the desired inclusion structure and their intersections are null. The measure properties then follow immediately from inclusion-exclusion arguments. □

5.4. **Regularity of Exhausting Sets.** To start out, we need to show that we can regularize τ at the level of the RPC.

Lemma 5.4.1. *For every η, ϵ, δ, there is an $m(\eta, \epsilon, \delta)$ such that*

$$Q(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

Proof. By disintegration

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\cup_i A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) = \mathbb{E}\mu^{\otimes\infty}(\cup_i E^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) &\geq \mathbb{E}\mu^{\otimes\infty}(\cup_i E^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu))\mathbb{1}_{\mu^{\otimes\infty}(\cup_i E^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu))=1} \\ &= P(\mu^{\otimes\infty}(\cup_i E^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) = 1) \end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu^{\otimes\mathcal{A}_r}(\cup_i E^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) = 1) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

By the Law of Large Numbers, it suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu^{\otimes\tau_m}(E_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) > 0) > 1 - \eta.$$

Let (U_α, v_α) be the decomposition of μ into nested balls as in Lemma 5.2.1. Then we know that

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=r} v_\alpha = 1$$

a.s.. Let τ_m be the $(m, \ldots, m)$-shaped tree, then

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau_m} v_\alpha \to 1$$

as $m \to \infty$ a.s.. Thus for every $\epsilon, \eta > 0$, there is an $m(\epsilon, \eta)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau_m} v_\alpha > 1 - \epsilon) \geq 1 - \eta$$

by standard arguments. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu^{\otimes\tau_m}(E_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu)) > 0) \geq 1 - \eta$$

by the same argument as for (5.2.1) in Lemma 5.2.1 by set incluson and the fact that $v_\alpha = \sum v_{\alpha n}$. □

Proposition 5.4.2. *For every η, ϵ, δ, there is an $M = M(\epsilon, \delta, \eta)$, an $m = m(\eta, \epsilon, \delta)$, and an $N_0(\eta, \epsilon, \delta)$ such that for $N \geq N_0$*

$$Q_N(\cup_{i=1}^{M} A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta$$

Proof. Fix m from Lemma 5.4.1. By monotonicity,

$$\lim_M Q(\cup_{i=1}^{M} A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) = Q(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta/4$$

so that there is an $M(\eta, \epsilon, \delta)$ such that for $\tilde{M} \geq M(\epsilon, \eta, \delta)$,

$$Q(\cup_{i=1}^{\tilde{M}} A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta/2$$

as desired.

Since $\cup_{i=1}^{M} A_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}$ is open it follows by weak convergence of Q_N that

$$\liminf Q_N(\cup_{i=1}^{M} A_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq Q(\cup_{i=1}^{M} A_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta/2$$

so that for N large enough

$$Q_N(\cup_{i=1}^{M} A_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}) \geq 1 - \eta$$

□

6. Hierarchical Clustering

In this section, we prove that the clusters constructed above are hierarchically clustering for μ_N. We then conclude by proving Theorem 1.2.2

In order to show these results, we introduce the following quantities. Let

$$f^N_{k,\epsilon}(\sigma) = \mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2 : (\sigma^1,\sigma^2) \le q_k - \epsilon, (\sigma^1,\sigma) \ge q_k, (\sigma^2,\sigma) \ge q_k\right) \tag{6.0.1}$$

which will encode (3.2.1). Similarly, for each $\alpha \nsim \beta \in \mathcal{A}_r$, define

$$g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2 : R_{12} \ge q_k + \epsilon, R_{1\gamma} \ge q_k, R_{2\delta} \ge q_k, R_{2\gamma} < q_k, R_{1\delta} < q_k\right). \tag{6.0.2}$$

This encodes (3.2.2).

6.1. **Preliminary lemmas.** Here we record some useful consequences of Panchenko's Ultrametricity Theorem.

Lemma 6.1.1. *Let $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$. There is a sequence $N_1(n)$ such that $N \ge N_1(n)$ gives*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes 3}(R_{12} \le R_{13} \wedge R_{23} - \epsilon_n) \le \epsilon_n.$$

and for all $k \in [r]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes 3}(R_{12} \ge q_k + \epsilon_n, R_{13} \ge q_k, R_{23} < q_k) \le \epsilon_n$$

Proof. Let $\bar{P}_N$ and $\bar{P}$ be P_N and P restricted to the coordinates R_{12}, R_{13}, and R_{23}.

The first claim follows from the ultrametricity theorem after noting that the relevant sets are $\bar{P}$ continuity sets for each n. To see the second claim, let

$$A^k_\epsilon = \{x_1 \ge q_k + \epsilon, x_2 \ge q_k, x_3 < q_k\},$$

which is a subset of $[-1,1]^3$. Note that

$$\bar{P}_N(A^k_\epsilon) = \mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes 3}(R_{12} \ge q_k + \epsilon, R_{13} \ge q_k, R_{23} < q_k) \tag{6.1.1}$$

and similarly for $\bar{P}(A^k_\epsilon)$. Since $A^k_\epsilon \subseteq A^k_0$, the result follows by set inclusion after noting that the latter set is a continuity set whose measure vanishes in the limit. As we are only considering finitely many sets for fixed n, we can chose a single $N_1(n)$ such that all of the above inequalities happen simultaneously. □

Lemma 6.1.2. *Let $f^N_{k,\epsilon}(\sigma^\alpha)$ be as in (6.0.1). Let m and M be fixed and $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$. Then for $N \ge N_1(n)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\tau^i_m} f_{k\sqrt{\epsilon_n}}(\sigma^\alpha_N) < \sqrt{\epsilon_n}, \forall i \in [M]\right) \ge 1 - rMm^r\sqrt{\epsilon_n}.$$

Proof. We suppress the superscript N and subscript ϵ. Observe that

$$\langle f_k(\sigma_N)\rangle = \mu_N^{\otimes 3}(R_{12} \le q_k - \epsilon, R_{13} \ge q_k, R_{23} \ge q_k) \le \mu_N^{\otimes 3}\left(R_{12} \le R_{13} \wedge R_{23} - \epsilon\right)$$

for each k. Now if we let $\epsilon = \epsilon_n$ be as in Lemma 6.1.1,then if $N \ge N_1(n)$, we have that by linearity,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{\alpha\in\tau^i_m} f_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma^\alpha_N)\right\rangle \le Mm^{r+1}\epsilon_n$$

thus by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{\alpha\in\tau^i_m} f_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma^\alpha_N) \ge \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right) \le Mm^{r+1}\sqrt{\epsilon_n}.$$

□

Lemma 6.1.3. *Fix $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}_r$ and let $k(\alpha,\beta) = |\alpha \wedge \beta| + 1$ and $g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon}$ as above. Then for M, m, ϵ_n, N as above, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(\sum_{\alpha \nsim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \tau_m^i} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}, \forall i \in [M]\right) \geq 1 - Mm^{2r+2}\sqrt{\epsilon_n}$$

Proof. This follows by the same argument as above after observing that for a fixed $\alpha, \beta, \in \tau_m$ with $\alpha \nsim \beta$, if $k = k(\alpha,\beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle g_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N)\rangle &= \mu_N^{\otimes 4}\left(R_{12} \geq q_k + \epsilon, R_{13} \geq q_k, R_{24} \geq q_k, R_{23} < q_k, R_{14} < q_k\right) \\ &\leq \mu_N^{\otimes 3}\left(R_{12} \geq q_k + \epsilon, R_{13} \geq q_k, R_{23} < q_k\right),\end{aligned}$$

and that $|\tau_m| \leq m^{r+1}$. □

6.2. **Approximate Ultrametricity.**

Lemma 6.2.1. *$\forall \eta, \epsilon, \delta$, there is an m, M, n_0 and a sequence $\tilde{N}(n;\eta,\epsilon,\delta)$ such that for $n \geq n_0$ and $N \geq \tilde{N}(n)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^M E_{\tau_m^i,\epsilon,\delta}(\mu_N)\right)\bigcap_{i=1}^M\left\{\sum_{\alpha\in\tau_m^i} f_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma_N^\alpha) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\} \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\nsim\beta\in\tau_m^i} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\}\right) \geq 1-\eta$$

Proof. Re-write this as

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(A \cap B \cap C\right).$$

By Proposition 5.4.2 and disintegration, we know that there is an $N_0(\eta,\epsilon,\delta)$ such that for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(A\right) \geq 1 - \eta/2.$$

By Lemma 6.1.2 and Lemma 6.1.3, if we let $\tilde{N} = N_1(n) \vee N_0(\eta,\epsilon,\delta)$, then for $N \geq \tilde{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(A \cap B \cap C) \geq 1 - \eta/2 - M(m^{2r+2} + m^{r+1})\sqrt{\epsilon_n}. \tag{6.2.1}$$

by inclusion-exclusion arguments. If we pick $n_0 \geq \lceil 2\lg\left(2M(m^{2r+2}+m^{r+1})/\eta\right)\rceil$, then for $n \geq n_0$ and $N \geq \tilde{N}(n;\eta,\epsilon,\delta)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(A \cap B \cap C) \geq 1 - \eta.$$

□

6.2.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.2.2.* We now begin the of Theorem 1.2.2

Theorem 6.2.2. *Let μ_N be as in Theorem 1.2.2. Then for any ζ-admissible sequence, there are sequences a_N, b_N, ϵ_N going to zero and $m_N \to \infty$ such that with probability tending to 1, there is a random collection of sets $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha\in\tau_{m_N}}$ that are an $(\epsilon_n, 0)$ hierarchical exhaustion that is (a_N, b_N)-hierarchically clustering.*

Proof. We begin by fixing a ζ-admissible $\{q_k\}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\eta_\nu = \epsilon_\nu = \delta_\nu = \frac{1}{2^\nu}$. By Lemma 6.2.1, for any ν, we know that there are m_ν, M_ν , $n_0(\nu)$, and a sequence $\tilde{N}(n;\nu)$ such that if we consider the set

$$E_\nu^N = \bigcup_{i=1}^{M_\nu} \tilde{E}_{\tau^i_{m_\nu},\epsilon_\nu,\delta_\nu}(\mu_N) \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\in\tau_{m_\nu}} f^N_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma_N^\alpha) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\} \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\nsim\beta} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\}$$

then for $n \geq n_0$ and $N \geq \tilde{N}(n;\nu)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(E_\nu^N\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^\nu}.$$

We can chose m_ν, M_ν, and similarly $n_0(\nu)$ such that they all tend to infinity as $\nu \to \infty$. (To see this, mimic the following argument.) Let $N(1) = \tilde{N}(n_0(1))$ and $N(\nu+1) = \tilde{N}(n_0(\nu+1);\nu) \vee (N(\nu)+1)$. By definition

$$N(\nu) \geq \frac{\nu(\nu-1)}{2} + N(1)$$

so if we let $\nu(N) = \sup\{\nu : N \geq N(\nu)\}$ we see that $\nu(N) \to \infty$ as well. We can then suppress the dependence of E_ν^N on ν. Similarly, we replace the dependence of all of the above in ν by its dependence on N. In particular, let $E^N = E^N_{\nu(N)}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(E^N) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^{\nu(N)}}. \tag{6.2.2}$$

Thus as $N \to \infty$, this probability tends to one.

We now define the relevant sets. On E^N, we let $i = \min\{j : \tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mu_N) \in A_{\tau^j_{m(N)}, \epsilon_{\nu(N)}, \delta_{\nu(N)}}\}$ and on $(E^N)^c$ set $i = -1$. Then on E^N, the $(B_\alpha)_{\alpha, \in \tau^i_{m(N)}}$ form an $(\epsilon_{\nu(N)}, \epsilon_{\nu(N)}/|\tau^i_{m(N)}|^2)$-hierarchical exhaustion by definition of the $\tilde{E}$'s from Section 3.4. By the same argument as in Corollary 3.4.3, we see that the sets

$$C_\alpha = B_\alpha \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \nsim \alpha} B_\beta$$

form a $(2\epsilon_{\nu(N)}, 0)$-hierarchical exhaustion. This gives us our exhaustion with $\epsilon_N = \epsilon_{\nu(N)}$, and $m(N)$. It remains to find the a_N and b_N, and to show (1.1.1) and (1.1.2).

These follow from the definition of $f_{k,\epsilon}$ and $g_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon}$. In particular, for the C_α, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in C_\alpha : (\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \leq q_{|\alpha|} - \epsilon_{n_0(N)}\right) &\leq \mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in B_\alpha : (\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \leq q_{|\alpha|} - \epsilon_{n_0(N)}\right) \\ &\leq \sum f^N_{|\alpha|, \epsilon_n}(\sigma^\alpha_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^\alpha \in C_\alpha, \sigma^\beta \in C_\beta : (\sigma^\alpha, \sigma^\beta) \geq q_{k+1} + \epsilon_{n_0(N)}\right) &\leq \mu_N^{\otimes 2}\left(\sigma^\alpha \in B_\alpha, \sigma^\beta \in B_\beta : (\sigma^\alpha, \sigma^\beta) \geq q_{k+1} + \epsilon_{n_0(N)}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\alpha,\beta \in \tau_m \\ \alpha \nsim \beta}} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Setting $a_N = \epsilon_{n_0(N)}$ and $b_N = \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}$ then gives us (1.1.1) and (1.1.2). □

Theorem 1.2.2 is then a restatement of this result.

6.3. **Regularity Properties of Clusters.** In this section, we prove the convergence of the weights of clusters at a fixed depth on τ_m to a Poisson-Dirichlet process.

On the event E^N, we define $i = \min\{j : \tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mu_N) \in A_{\tau^j_{m_N}, \epsilon_{\nu(N)}, \delta_{\nu(N)}}\}$ as in Theorem 6.2.2 and

$$\tilde{Y}^N_{\alpha - i} = \begin{cases} C_\alpha & \alpha \in \tau^i_m \\ \emptyset & else \end{cases}$$

where by $\alpha - i$ we mean the vertex we get by subtracting $i \cdot m$ from the first coordinate of α. On the event $(E^N)^c$ set $i = -1$ and $\tilde{Y}^N_\alpha = \emptyset$, for all α in $\mathcal{A}_r$. Finally, let

$$Y^N_\alpha = \mu_N(\tilde{Y}^N_\alpha). \tag{6.3.1}$$

This gives us a sequence $Y_N \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{A}_r}$. Our goal is to show that if we consider the weights corresponding to those $\alpha \in \partial\tau_m$ and look at (v^N_n), their decreasing rearrangement, this sequence of random variables converges in distribution to a Poisson-Dirichlet process when considered as elements of the space of mass-partitions

$$\mathcal{P}_m = \left\{(v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} : \sum v_i \leq 1, v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \ldots \geq 0\right\}$$

One equips this space with the subspace topology induced by the product topology on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. For more on this space see [1, 5].

The proof of this result follows from an application of Talagrand's Identities after making the following observation: due to the ultrametric nature of the C_α, the indicator function of the event that two draws land in the same C_α is well approximated by a function of the overlap. This makes precise the idea that we do a decomposition into pure states with the C_α.

We begin by proving the aforementioned observation. Let

$$U^N(\sigma^1,\sigma^2) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\exists \alpha\in\mathbb{N}^r:\sigma^1,\sigma^2\in\tilde{Y}^N_\alpha\}} = \mathbb{1}_{\text{both land in the same } \tilde{Y}^N_\alpha}.$$

We denote this by U^N_{12} as well.

Lemma 6.3.1. *Let $\phi_\kappa(x)$ be the piece-wise linear function that is 0 on $[0, q_r-\kappa)$ and 1 on $[q_r,1]$, where $\max\{|q_k|-|q_{k-1}|\} > \kappa > 0$. Then*

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left\langle |U^N_{12} - \phi_\kappa(R_{12})|\right\rangle_{\mu_N} \le 2\zeta[q_r-\kappa, q_r+\kappa].$$

Proof. We leave out the dependence on μ_N in the Gibbs expectations and N in the overlap for readability. Let

$$\Delta = |U^N_{12} - \phi_\kappa(R_{12})|$$

and let L_N denote the event that both σ^1 and σ^2 land in $\cup_{|\alpha|=r} Y_\alpha$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\langle\Delta\rangle = \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta(\mathbb{1}_{(E^N)^c} + \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N^c} + \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N})\right\rangle = \eta(N) + 2\epsilon_{\nu(N)} + I$$

by Theorem 6.2.2, where the first comes from (6.2.2) and the second from the fact that $\tilde{Y^N_\alpha}$ are an $(2\epsilon_{\nu(N)},0)$-hierarchical exhaustion. We break up I by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N} U_{12}\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\ge q_r}\right\rangle + \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta\mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}U_{12}\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}<q_r}\right\rangle + \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta\mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}(1-U_{12})\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\ge q_r-\kappa}\right\rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta\mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}(1-U_{12})\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}<q_r-\kappa}\right\rangle = II + III + IV + V. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of ϕ_κ and U_{12}, $II = V = 0$.

Furthermore, for N large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} IV/2 &\le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}\left(\sum_{\substack{\alpha\nsim\beta\\ \alpha,\beta\in\partial\tau_{m(N)}}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1\in\tilde{Y}^N_\alpha,\sigma^2\in\tilde{Y}^N_\beta}\right)\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\ge q_r-\kappa}\right\rangle \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}\left(\sum_{\substack{\alpha\nsim\beta\\ \alpha,\beta\in\partial\tau_{m(N)}}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1\in\tilde{Y}^N_\alpha,\sigma^2\in\tilde{Y}^N_\beta}\right)\left[\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\ge q_r+\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\in[q_r-\kappa,q_r+\kappa]}\right]\right\rangle \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N,L_N}\left(\sum_{\alpha\nsim\beta} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\right)\right\rangle + \zeta_N[q_r-\kappa,q_r+\kappa] \le \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \zeta_N[q_r-\kappa,q_r+\kappa]. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality comes from taking N large enough that $\epsilon_{n_0(N)} < \kappa$, breaking up the interval $[q_r-\kappa,1]$ as $[q_r-\kappa,q_r+\kappa]\cup[q_r+\epsilon_{n_0(N)},1]$, and using the union bound. The third inequality follows from the definition of g in (6.0.2) and set inclusion. The fourth inequality follows from the definition of E^N. It remains to study III.

We begin again by breaking up the event.

$$III \le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N}U_{12}\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}<q_r-\epsilon_{n_0}}\right\rangle + \mathbb{E}\left\langle \Delta U_{12}\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\in[q_r-\epsilon_{n_0},q_r)}\right\rangle = (i)+(ii).$$

Observe that

$$(i) = 2\mathbb{E}\left\langle \sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau_{m(N)}} f_{r,\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}(\sigma^\alpha)\mathbb{1}_{E^N}\right\rangle \le 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}.$$

On the interval $[q_r - \epsilon_{n_0}, q_r)$,

$$\phi_\kappa(x) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}{\kappa} \text{ so that } (ii) \leq \frac{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}{\kappa}.$$

Combining these results then gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle |U_{12} - \phi_\kappa(R_{12})| \right\rangle \leq \eta(N) + 2(\epsilon_{\nu(N)} + \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \zeta_N[q_r - \kappa, q_r + \kappa]) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \frac{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}{\kappa}$$

Taking limit superiors gives the desired result. □

Fix an n, an s, and a partition $\sqcup_{k=1}^s I_k = [n]$. Let

$$F^N(\sigma^1, \ldots, \sigma^n) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\forall k \in [s], \exists \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^r : \forall i \in I_k, \sigma^i \in \tilde{Y}_\alpha^N\}} = \prod_{k=1}^s \prod_{i,j \in I_k} U_{ij}^N. \tag{6.3.2}$$

In words, we partition the set $[n]$ into groups and ask if the groups are lying in the same $\tilde{Y}_\alpha^N$. Define F_κ^N similarly using ϕ_κ. The above result then has the following corollary.

Corollary 6.3.2. *Fix n,s, and I_k as above, and $\kappa > 0$. Then*

$$\limsup \mathbb{E}\left\langle |F^N - F_\kappa| \right\rangle \leq 2n(n-1)\zeta[q_r - \kappa, q_r + \kappa].$$

The proof of the above follows by induction and the fact that U_{ij} and ϕ_κ are bounded by 1, so we omit it. The rest is standard. First we find the parameter for the process.

Lemma 6.3.3. *Let U_{12}^N as above, then*

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N \right\rangle_N = \zeta[q_r, 1]$$

Proof. Note that

$$|\mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N \right\rangle_N - \zeta[q_r, 1]| \leq |\mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N - \phi_\kappa \right\rangle_N| + |\mathbb{E}\left\langle \phi_\kappa \right\rangle_N - \mathbb{E}\left\langle \phi_\kappa \right\rangle_\infty| + |\mathbb{E}\left\langle \phi_\kappa \right\rangle_\infty - \zeta[q_r, 1]| = I + II + III.$$

By convergence of the law of the overlap,

$$I \leq \mathbb{E}\left\langle |U_{12}^N - \phi_\kappa| \right\rangle, \; II \to 0, \text{ and } III \leq \zeta[q_r - \kappa, q_r).$$

If we combine these, we see that by Lemma 6.3.1,

$$\limsup |\mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N \right\rangle_N - \zeta[q_r, 1)| \leq \zeta[q_r - \kappa, q_r) + 2\zeta[q_r - \kappa, q_r + \kappa].$$

The result then follows after sending $\kappa \to 0$. □

Then we show that the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities hold for the relevant functions.

Lemma 6.3.4. *Fix n,s and I_k as above. Then we have the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities*

$$\lim |n\mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{1,n+1}^N F^N \right\rangle - \mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N \right\rangle \mathbb{E}\left\langle F^N \right\rangle - \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}\left\langle F^N U_{1,k}^N \right\rangle| = 0. \tag{6.3.3}$$

Proof. Note that by the Approximate Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities,

$$\lim |n\mathbb{E}\left\langle \phi_\kappa(R_{1n+1}) F_\kappa \right\rangle - \mathbb{E}\left\langle \phi_\kappa(R_{12}) \right\rangle \mathbb{E}\left\langle F_\kappa \right\rangle - \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}\left\langle F_\kappa \phi_\kappa(R_{1k}) \right\rangle| = 0$$

for every κ positive. Using boundedness of the relevant functions, Lemma 6.3.1, and Corollary 6.3.2, we see that by a standard approximation argument

$$\limsup |n\mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{1,n+1}^N F^N \right\rangle - \mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{12}^N \right\rangle \mathbb{E}\left\langle F^N \right\rangle - \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left\langle F^N U_{1,k}^N \right\rangle| \leq C(n)\zeta[q_r - \kappa, q_r + \kappa].$$

where $C(n)$ is finite and depends only on n. Sending $\kappa \to 0$ gives the result since q_r is a ζ -continuity point. □

We end this section by showing the convergence to the Poisson-Dirichlet weights

Theorem 6.3.5. *The weights (v_n^N) satisfy Talagrand's identities in the limit. In particular they converge in distribution to $PD(\zeta[0,q_r])$*

Proof. Let

$$S_N(n_1,\ldots,n_s) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{k\le s}\sum v_n^{n_k} = \mathbb{E}\left\langle F^N\right\rangle.$$

Note that

$$S_N(n_1+1,\ldots,n_s) = \mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{1,n+1}^N F^N\right\rangle \text{ and } S_N(n_2,\ldots,n_k+n_1,\ldots,n_s) = \mathbb{E}\left\langle U_{1k}^N F^N\right\rangle$$

so that by the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities (6.3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} nS_N(n_1+1,\ldots,n_s) &= S_N(2)S_N(n_1,\ldots,n_s) + (n_1-1)S_N(n_1,\ldots,n_s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{2\le k\le s} n_k S_N(n_2,\ldots,n_k+n_1,\ldots,n_s) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

For $k \ge 2$, we know that on $\mathcal{P}_m$, the polynomials $p_k((v_n)) = \sum_n v_n^k$ are continuous (bounded) functions in (v_n) [20]. If we then pass to a weakly convergent subsequence of (v_n^N)'s, all of the $S_N(\ldots)$'s will converge. For any such limit point, we then have that the Talagrand Identities with parameter $\theta = \zeta[0,q_r)$ hold exactly. The latter uniquely specifies the limit point as $PD(\zeta[0,q_r))$ [24, 20]. Thus, by the subsequence principle we know that the sequence properly converges. □

Note that by simply forgetting the last $r-k$ overlap values, we have the following corollary. Alternatively, one could repeat the above proofs modifying as necessary.

Corollary 6.3.6. *The same is true if one rearranges the vertices at any fixed depth k except the parameter for the Poisson-Dirichlet Process becomes $\zeta[0,q_k)$.*

7. Convergence to Ruelle Cascades

In this section, we improve on the above, by showing that the collection of all of the weights above, once correctly rearranged, form a Ruelle Probability Cascade in the limit.

Let Y_α^N be as before, and let $\mathbf{v}^N = (v_\alpha^N)$ be these weights placed in standard order. (We point out here that $v_\alpha = 0$ is possible.) Note that these weights can be thought of as random variables in the space of cascades of depth r.

Definition 7.0.7. The space of *Cascades of depth r* is the space

$$\mathcal{C}_r = \{(w_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_r} \in [0,1]^{\mathcal{A}_r} : w_{\alpha 1} \ge w_{\alpha 2} \ge \ldots \ge 0; \sum_{|\alpha|=k} w_\alpha \le 1, \forall k \in [r]; w_\alpha \ge \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} w_\beta\}$$

which is topologized as a subspace of the product space $[0,1]^{\mathcal{A}_r}$. A *cascade* is an element of this space. A cascade is said to be *proper* or a *probability cascade* if the inequalities relating to the sums are all equalities. Otherwise the cascade is called *improper*.

For ease of notation we omit the depth when talking about the space of cascades when it is not ambiguous. The space of cascades is compact and Polish. Notice that in this language, an RPC is a random variable in the space of cascades that is almost surely proper. We note that this space of cascades is different from that defined in [23], though one can go from a cascade in the sense of Ruelle to a cascade in the above sense.

Our goal is to show that the above sequence of weights converges in distribution to a Ruelle Probability Cascade. The proof follows from an application of the uniqueness portion of the Dovbysh-Sudakov theorem. In particular, we encode the cascades into ROSts and use this to uniquely identify properties of the limit. As before the key observation is that the relative locations of points in the cascade is well approximated by their overlaps. The proof is in two parts. First we describe a map taking a cascade to a ROSt and demonstrate that if $\mathbf{v}$ is a limit point of the sequence $\mathbf{v}^N$, then for any subsequence that converges to it, the corresponding sequence of ROSts converges to that of $\mathbf{v}$. We then show that for the sequence $\mathbf{v}^N$, the corresponding sequence of ROSts has only one limit point which is an RPC. This combined with the previous result and the uniqueness portion of Dovbysh-Sudakov uniquely identifies all of the limit points as being the same RPC, so that we can conclude the result by the subsequence principle.

7.1. **Convergence to the ROSt of the limit point.** The first part of the proof requires studying an encoding of the above distributions into a ROSt. For any cascade $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_r$, let

$$v_\partial = 1 - \sum_{|\alpha|=r} v_\alpha.$$

We think of ∂ as the dustbin where we place the dust from the Ruelle Probability Cascade (see [5] for the corresponding terminology for mass partitions).

We set up the encoding as follows. Let $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in (\mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}}$ be orthonormal basis vectors for ℓ_2. Consider the vectors

$$h_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \precsim \alpha} (q_{|\beta|} - q_{|\beta|-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} e_\beta \tag{7.1.1}$$

for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_r$ and $h_\partial = \sqrt{q_r} e_\partial$, where $q_0 = 0$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_r$ and sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$, we define the map $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{C}_r \times [0,1]^r \to \Pr B_{\ell_2}(0,1)$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}, \{q_k\}; h_\alpha) = \begin{cases} v_\alpha & \alpha \neq \partial \\ v_\partial & \alpha = \partial. \end{cases} \tag{7.1.2}$$

In the following we suppress the dependence on the sequence $\{q_k\}$ when it is unambiguous. Note that on the space of proper cascades this map is injective. It then extends as a map from the space of probability measures on proper cascades to the space of laws of ROSts.

Take $\mathbf{v}^N$ as above and $\mathbf{v}$ a limit point such that $\mathbf{v}^{N_k} \overset{(d)}{\to} \mathbf{v}$ for some subsequence $\{N_k\}$. We denote the corresponding Gram-DeFinetti laws of the associated ROSt by $\mathcal{L}_N$ and $\mathcal{L}$. Our goal will be to show that these sequences converge weakly. We begin by showing convergence of the dustbins.

Lemma 7.1.1. *Let $S_d^{(N)} = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} v_\alpha^N$ and $S_d = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} v_\alpha$ where (v_α) is a distributional limit point of the sequence (v_α^N). Then if N_l is a subsequence along which this convergence happens, $S_d^{N_l} \overset{(d)}{\to} S_d$. for every $d \in [r]$.Furthermore this convergence can be taken to happen simultaneously with the convergence of the $(v_\alpha^{N_l})$.*

Proof. We work with $d = r$. The proof for the rest of the result follows *mutatus mutandis*. We also pass to the subsequence immediately to avoid cumbersome notation. Let

$$\eta_N^k = \sum_{\alpha \in \partial \tau_k} v_\alpha^N \text{ and } \eta^k = \sum_{\alpha \in \partial \tau_k} v_\alpha.$$

Notice that $\eta_N^k \overset{(d)}{\to} \eta^k$ and that $\eta^k \overset{(d)}{\to} S_r$. By an approximation theorem (see [14]), it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left(|\eta_N^k - S_r^N| \right) = 0.$$

To see this, fix τ_k. Let $\tau_{k,l}$ be the $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}, \ldots, \mathbb{N}, k, \ldots, k)$-shaped tree where there are l $\mathbb{N}$'s in the r-tuple. Note that $\tau_{k,0} = \tau_k$ and $\tau_{k,r} = \mathcal{A}_r$ For any subset $\tau' \subset \mathcal{A}_r$, let

$$S^{(N)}(\tau') = \sum_{\alpha \in \tau'} v_\alpha^N$$

and similarly for $S(\tau')$ in the limit. Note that

$$|S_r^N - \eta_N^k| \leq \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} |S^{(N)}(\partial \tau_{k,l+1}) - S^{(N)}(\partial \tau_{k,l})|,$$

so it suffices to show that each summand vanishes upon taking expectations and limits. To see this, consider the difference

$$|S^{(N)}(\partial \tau_{k,l+1}) - S^{(N)}(\partial \tau_{k,l})| = S(\partial \tau_{k,l+1} \setminus \partial \tau_{k,l}) \leq S(\partial(\mathcal{A}_r \cap \{\alpha_{l+1} > k\})).$$

Since the sum of the children is less than that of their parents at every level by definition of $\mathcal{C}_r$, this sum is at most

$$RHS \leq \sum_{|\alpha|=l, n\geq k+1} v_{\alpha n}^{(N)} = S(\partial(\mathcal{A}_{l+1} \cap \{\alpha_{l+1} > k\})).$$

Let $\tilde{v}_m^{l+1,N}$ be the decreasing rearrangement of $(v_\alpha^N)_{|\alpha|=l+1}$. Then

$$RHS \leq \sum_{m\geq k+1} \tilde{v}_m^{l+1,N}$$

since (v_α) are in standard order and thus the previous sum must be missing the contribution of the first k of each family at depth $l+1$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}|S^{(N)}(\tau_{k,l+1}) - S^{(N)}(\tau_{k,l})| \leq \epsilon + \mathbb{P}(\sum_{m\geq k+1} \tilde{v}_m^{l+1,N} \geq \epsilon/2).$$

For each l, we have $(\tilde{v}_m^{l,N}) \overset{(d)}{\to} (\tilde{v}_m^l)$ where $(\tilde{v}_m^l) \sim PD(\zeta[0, q_k])$ by Theorem 6.3.5. This means that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\sum_{m\geq k+1} \tilde{v}_m^{l,N} \geq \epsilon/2) \leq \limsup_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\sum_{m\leq k} \tilde{v}_m^{l,N} \leq 1-\epsilon/2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\sum_{m\geq k+1} \tilde{v}_m^l \leq 1-\epsilon/2) \leq \epsilon$$

for $k \geq k_0$ for some appropriately chosen k_0. Combining these results gives the result.

That the convergence happens simultaneously can be seen by using the fact that the relevant spaces are metrizable and that adding the dustbin can be done by adding an extra factor of $[0,1]$ with the usual product metric. □

Remark 7.1.2. We would like to point out here that as a consequence of the above convergence and the compactness of $\mathcal{C}_r$, we have that for $\mathbf{v}$ as above,

$$v_\alpha = \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} v_\beta.$$

This coupled with the injectivity of the map from proper cascades to ROSts will be used in the subsequent.

With this in hand we can now show the convergence of the overlap distributions.

Lemma 7.1.3. *Let* $\mathbf{v}$ *be a limit point of the sequence* $\mathbf{v}^N$ *and let* $\mathbf{v}^{N_k} \to \mathbf{v}$. *It follows that* $\mathcal{L}_{N_k} \overset{(d)}{\to} \mathcal{L}$

Proof. For ease of notation, we pass to the subsequence and eliminate the subscript k in the above. Note that

$$(v_\alpha^N, v_\partial^N, S_d^N) \overset{(d)}{\to} (v_\alpha, v_\partial, S_d).$$

By Skorokhod's representation theorem, there is a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ and random variables

$$(w_\alpha^n, w_\partial^N, W_d^N) \overset{(d)}{=} (v_\alpha^N, v_\partial^N, S_d^N)$$

and similarly for $(w_\alpha, w_\partial, W_d)$ such that

$$(w_\alpha^n, w_\partial^N, W_r^N) \to (w_\alpha, w_\partial, W_d)$$

$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-almost surely. Note that by the distributional equality, for any $f \in C[-1,1]^{n^2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\langle f\rangle_{\mathcal{R}(v^N)} = \mathbb{E}\langle f\rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w^N)}$$

as the map $w^N \mapsto \langle f\rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w^N)}$ is bounded and measurable (though not necessarily continuous). Thus it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{E}\langle f\rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w^N)} \to \mathbb{E}\langle f\rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w)}.$$

We begin by noting that

$$w_\partial^N + \sum w_\alpha^N = 1 = w_\partial + \sum w_\alpha,$$

so that by Scheffé's lemma, we have the convergence

$$(w_\alpha^N, w_\partial^N) \to (w_\alpha, w_\partial)$$

in $\ell_1(\partial\mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\})$ almost surely. As a result,

$$\langle f \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w^N)} = \sum_{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_m \in \partial\mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\}} w_{\alpha_1} \dots w_{\alpha_m} f\left((h_{\alpha_i}, h_{\alpha_j})\right)$$

converges to $\langle f \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(w)}$ almost surely by an $\epsilon/3$-type argument. The convergence of the means then follows by bounded convergence theorem. □

7.2. **Convergence of the ROSts to an RPC.** We begin with the following approximation argument which is similar to Lemma 6.3.1. In the following we fix $q_0 = 0$ and $q_{r+1} = 1$

Lemma 7.2.1. *Fix $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{N}^{r+1}$ distinct. Let $k = |\tilde{\alpha} \wedge \tilde{\beta}|$. Let*

$$A(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) = \left\{ \exists \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^r, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}^k : \gamma = \alpha \wedge \beta, \sigma^{\tilde{\alpha}} \in \tilde{Y}_\alpha, \sigma^{\tilde{\beta}} \in \tilde{Y}_\beta \right\}$$

and for each $\kappa > 0$ such that $\kappa < \min_k\{|q_k - q_{k+1}|\}/3$, set

$$B_\kappa = \{R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \in [q_k - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]\}.$$

where if $k = r$, the latter set ends at $q_{r+1} = 1$, and if $k = 0$ it begins at $q_0 = 0$. Then

$$\limsup \mathbb{E}\left\langle |\mathbb{1}_{A(\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta})} - \mathbb{1}_{B_\kappa}| \right\rangle \le \zeta[q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k>0} + \zeta[q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k<r}.$$

Proof. We drop the subscript κ and suppress the dependence of A for readability. The proof follows by case analysis. First break up

$$\mathbb{E}\langle |\mathbb{1}_A - \mathbb{1}_B| \rangle \le \mathbb{E}\langle |\dots|\mathbb{1}_{E^N}\rangle + \mathbb{P}((E^N)^c) \le I + \frac{1}{2^{\nu(N)}}$$

where the second inequality follows from the definition of E^N.

Let L_N be the event that both $\sigma^{\tilde{\alpha}}$ and $\sigma^{\tilde{\beta}}$ are in $\cup_{|\alpha|=r}\tilde{Y}_\alpha$. Break up I as follows.

$$I \le 2\mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N, L_N}\left(\mathbb{1}_{A\cap B^c} + \mathbb{1}_{B\cap A^c}\right) + \mathbb{1}_{E^N, L_N^c} \right\rangle \le 2(II + III) + 2\epsilon_{\nu(N)}.$$

On B^c either

$$R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \ge q_{k+1} + \epsilon_{n_0(N)} \text{ or } R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} < q_k - \epsilon_{n_0(N)}$$

for N large enough, where the first case is impossible if $k = r$ and the second is impossible if $k = 0$. Thus

$$II \le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N, L_N\cap A}\mathbb{1}_{R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \ge q_{k+1}+\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} \right\rangle \mathbb{1}_{k<r} + \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N, L_N\cap A}\mathbb{1}_{R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} < q_k-\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} \right\rangle \mathbb{1}_{k>0} \le 2\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0}(N)},$$

after integrating first in the "tilded" variables , where the second inequality comes from the fact that both terms in on the RHS are at least q_k.

We turn now to III. On A^c, we have that

$$\nexists \gamma : |\gamma| = |\tilde{\alpha} \wedge \tilde{\beta}| \text{ and } \sigma^{\tilde{\alpha}}, \sigma^{\tilde{\beta}} \in \tilde{Y}_\gamma$$

On $A^c \cap L_N$, we also have an α, β and γ such that $\gamma = \alpha \wedge \beta$ with $\sigma^{\tilde{\alpha}} \in \tilde{Y}_\alpha$, $\sigma^{\tilde{\beta}} \in \tilde{Y}_\beta$, but $|\gamma| \ne k$.

We break up III as follows

$$III \le \mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N\cap A^c\cap B\cap L_N}\left(\mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|<k-1} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=k-1} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|=k+1} + \mathbb{1}_{|\gamma|>k+1}\right)\right\rangle = (iii) + (iv) + (v) + (vi).$$

If $|\gamma| < k-1$,possible only if $k > 1$, then on $A^c \cap B \cap L_N$

$$R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \ge q_k - \kappa \ge q_{k+1} - \epsilon_{n_0(N)} \ge q_{|\gamma|+1} + \epsilon_{n_0(N)}$$

for N large enough so that

$$(iii) \le \mathbb{1}_{k>1}\mathbb{E}\left\langle \mathbb{1}_{E^N}\left(\sum_{\alpha\sim\beta} g_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\right) \right\rangle \le \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}.$$

If$|\gamma| > k+1$, possible only when $k < r$,

$$R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \leq q_{k+1} + \kappa < q_{|\gamma|} - \epsilon_{n_0(N)}$$

which is controlled similarly by f so

$$(vi) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0}(N)}\mathbb{1}_{k<r}.$$

If $|\gamma| = k+1$, again possible only if $k < r$, then either

$$R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \in [q_k - \kappa, q_{k+1} - \kappa] \text{ or } R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \in [q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]$$

which are controlled by f and bounded by $\zeta_N[q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]$ respectively. Thus

$$(v) \leq (\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \zeta_N[q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa])\mathbb{1}_{k<r}$$

Finally if $|\gamma| = k-1$, again possible only if $k > 0$, then either

$$R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \in [q_k + \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa] \text{ or } R_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} \in [q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]$$

which are controlled by g and bounded by $\zeta_N[q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]$ respectively, so

$$(iv) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \zeta_N[q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k>0}$$

Combining all of these gives

$$III \leq 4\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} + \zeta_N[q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k>0} + \zeta_N[q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k<r}$$

Combine II and III and take limit superiors of both sides to arrive at

$$\limsup \mathbb{E}\left\langle|\mathbb{1}_A - \mathbb{1}_B|\right\rangle \leq \zeta[q_k - \kappa, q_k + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k>0} + \zeta[q_{k+1} - \kappa, q_{k+1} + \kappa]\mathbb{1}_{k<r}.$$

□

Note that since the q_k are continuity points, we have the following, which follows by a standard approximation argument.

Corollary 7.2.2. *Set $\kappa = 0$ in the definition of B_κ. Then*

$$\limsup_{N\to 0} \mathbb{E}\left\langle|\mathbb{1}_A - \mathbb{1}_{B_0}|\right\rangle = 0.$$

With this observation, we now show that any limit point of the overlap structure corresponding to the v^N's must an RPC. To do this consider the following. Let the function Γ be defined by

$$\Gamma(q) = \begin{cases} q_k & q \in [q_k, q_{k+1}) \\ q_r & q \geq q_r \\ 0 & q \in [0, q_1), \end{cases} \tag{7.2.1}$$

and define the Γ-*approximator* to μ be the overlap distribution you get by pushing the distribution of μ through by the map $R_{ij} \mapsto \Gamma(R_{ij})$. Recall from Fact 3.3.2 that the Γ-approximator to μ is given by a RPC with the jump weights $\zeta_k = \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1})$ (with $q_0 = 0$).

Consider a matrix of possible overlap values $(q_{ij})_{ij\leq n}$. Corresponding to this matrix there is a tree τ whose structure mimics the ultrametric defined by this matrix. If q_{ij} takes on the values $\{q_k\}_{k=0}^r$, then this tree is of depth $r+1$. We generate such a tree as follows: take the points $[n]$ as the leaves and create root leaf paths of length $r+1$ to each of them. If i and j are such that $q_{ij} = q_k$, then we join their paths starting at the root and ending at depth k. We call such a tree an *encoding* of the overlap structure (q_{ij}).

View $\mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\}$ as a tree by adding a root leaf path to $\mathcal{A}_r$ with one vertex at each level ending in ∂. For any finite rooted tree τ of depth $r+1$, we let

$$h(\tau) = Emb(T(\tau; r), \mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\})$$

be the set of embeddings of $T(\tau; r)$, the tree of depth r obtained by deleting the leaves of τ, into $\mathcal{A}_r \cup \{\partial\}$, and let

$$\mathcal{P}(\tau) = \{n_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\tau,|\alpha|=r}$$

where $n_\alpha = card(child(\alpha))$. With this we can then prove the next step in the convergence result.

Lemma 7.2.3. *The ROSt corresponding to $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}^N)$ converges in law to the Γ-approximator of μ.*

Proof. Define $A(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ as above making explicit the dependence on $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$. Let τ be the encoding of the overlap structure (q_{ij}). Notice that

$$\langle R^n = (q_{ij}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}^N)} = \sum_{\phi \in h(\tau)} \prod_{\alpha \in \partial T(\tau; r)} v_{\phi(\alpha)}^{n_\alpha}.$$

It follows that

$$|\langle R^n = (q_{ij}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}^N)} - \left\langle \prod_{\tilde{\alpha}} \neq \tilde{\beta} \in \partial\tau \right\rangle \mathbb{1}_{A(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})} \mathbb{1}_{E^N} |_{\mu_N} \leq \left\langle (E^N)^c \right\rangle + \left\langle E^N \cap L_N^c \right\rangle$$

where $L_N = L_N(\tau)$ is again the event that all of the replica indexed by $\partial\tau$ lands inside of $\cup_{|\alpha|=r} \tilde{Y}_\alpha^N$. The first term comes from the case where ∂ is in the image and gets all of the mass (i.e. all of the $v_\alpha = 0$). The second case comes from the chance that ∂ is in the image and gets some of the mass. Taking expectations then gives us

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle R^n = (q_{ij}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}^N)} - \mathbb{E} \left\langle \prod_{\alpha \neq \beta \in \partial\tau} \mathbb{1}_{A(\alpha, \beta)} \mathbb{1}_{E^N} \right\rangle_{\mu_N} | \leq \mathbb{P}((E^N)^c) + \mathbb{P}(E^N \cap L_N^c)$$

which is vanishing by Theorem 6.2.2. By Corollary 7.2.2 it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle \prod_{\alpha \neq \beta \in \partial\tau} \mathbb{1}_{A(\alpha, \beta)} \mathbb{1}_{E^N} \right\rangle_{\mu_N} \to \mathbb{E} \langle R_{ij} \in I_{ij} \rangle_\mu$$

where if we let k_{ij} be such that $q_{ij} = q_k$, $I_{ij} = [q_{ij}, q_{k_{ij}+1}]$. Combining these gives the result. □

7.2.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.2.4.* We can then prove the main result.

Theorem 7.2.4. *The sequence $\mathbf{v}^N$ converges to the weights of an RPC with weights ζ_k as in Fact 3.3.2.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{v}$ is a limit point of the sequence $\mathbf{v}^N$. Pass to a subsequence which converges to $\mathbf{v}$. By Lemma 7.1.3, we know that for this subsequence

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}^{N_k})) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v})).$$

By Lemma 7.2.3, however, we know that the overlap distributions have a unique limit point, namely the Γ-approximator to μ. The latter corresponds to an RPC, by Fact 3.3.2.

Let ν be the Dovbysh-Sudakov measure corresponding to the RPC. By the above we know that, since its overlap distribution is the same as $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}))$, there is a coupling of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v})$ and ν, and a random isometry T from the closed linear span of the support of ν to that of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v})$ such that almost surely $T_* \nu = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v})$.

In particular this means that there is a random bijection $\pi : \partial\mathcal{A}_r \to \partial\mathcal{A}_r$ such that $T h_\alpha = h_{\pi(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \in \partial\mathcal{A}_r$. Our goal will be to show that $\pi = Id$.

We begin by noting that since T is an isometry and there are only finitely many possible distances, π extends to all of $\mathcal{A}_r$ in such a way that it preserves the parent-child relationship, $\pi(\alpha) \wedge \pi(\beta) = \pi(\alpha \wedge \beta)$.

Let W_α be the weights of the cascade arranged in standard order. Observe that

$$W_\alpha = T_* \nu(h_{\pi(\alpha)}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}; h_\pi(\alpha)) = v_{\pi(\alpha)},$$

for $\alpha \in \partial\mathcal{A}_r$. Since π preserves the parent-child relationship, and since v_α is the sum over all children β of α of the v_β and similarly for W_α, it follows that this equality extends to the whole tree. The W_n are almost surely distinct, therefore v_n must be as well. As both are already in decreasing order, it follows that $W_n = v_n$. Continue this argument down the tree. This implies $\pi = Id$. Thus the two sets of weights are equal in law. □

8. Talagrand's Orthogonal Structures Conjecture

We study here the proof of the orthogonal structures conjecture. We begin with a few preliminary results about Poisson-Dirichlet processes. These results, combined with approximate ultrametricity and the Talagrand Positivity Principle will then establish the theorem. The proofs of the following are standard exercises in weak convergence and Talagrand's Identities, so we omit them.

Lemma 8.0.5. *Fix $\theta \in (0,1)$, and let $\mathbf{v} = (v_n) \sim PD(\theta)$. Then for any $p \in (0,1)$, there is a sequence of positive real numbers (a_k) such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(v_k > a_k, \forall k) \geq p$$

Lemma 8.0.6. *Let $\mathbf{v}_n \sim PD(\theta_n)$. If there is a $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that $\theta_n \to \theta$, then $\mathbf{v}_n \overset{(d)}{\to} \mathbf{v}$ where $\mathbf{v} \sim PD(\theta)$.*

Lemma 8.0.7. *Take $q^{(n)} \to 0$ continuity points of ζ. Let $\theta_n = \zeta[0, q^{(n)})$ and let $\mathbf{v}_n \sim PD(\theta_n)$. If 0 is an atom of ζ, then for every $p \in (0,1)$ there is a sequence (a_k) of positive real numbers such that for every ϵ positive and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(v_k^n > a_k \forall k \leq k_0) \geq p \text{ and } q^{(n)} < \epsilon.$$

Lemma 8.0.8. *For each n, let $Y^{n,N}$ be defined as in (6.3.1) for $\{q^n\}$. Then for every $p \in (0,1)$, there is a sequence (a_k) such that for every $\epsilon > 0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an n_0 and an N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k^{N,n_0} > a_k \forall k \leq k_0) \geq p \text{ and } q^{n_0} < \epsilon$$

Proof. Recall that by Theorem 6.3.5, for each n

$$Y^{n,N} \to Y^n$$

weakly where $Y^n \sim PD(\zeta[0, q^n))$. It then follows from Lemma 8.0.7 that for every $p \in (0,1)$ there is a sequence (a_k) such that for every ϵ, k_0 as above, there is an n_0 such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k^{n_0} > a_k \forall k \leq k_0) \geq \frac{1+p}{2}$$

Combining these results and using again the fact that A_k as defined in Lemma 8.0.5 is open then gives us that there is an N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k^{n_0,N} > a_k, \forall k \leq k_0) \geq p.$$

□

Lemma 8.0.9. *For every ϵ, η positive, there is an $\tilde{N}$ such that for $N \geq \tilde{N}$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(R_{12} < -\epsilon) > \epsilon/3) < \eta.$$

The proof follows from Proposition 3.3.1 as before so we omit it.

Theorem 8.0.10 (Orthogonal Structures)**.** *There is a sequence $(\tilde{a}_k)$ of positive numbers such that for every ϵ positive and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an N_* such that for $N \geq N_*$, with probability at least 3/4,*

$$\exists \{A_k^N\}_{k \leq k_0} \subset \Sigma_N : \mu_N(A_k^N) \geq \tilde{a}_k$$

and

$$\forall k, l \leq k_0, k \neq l, \left\langle |R_{12}| \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in A_k, \sigma^2 \in A_l} \right\rangle \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Using Lemma 8.0.8, we know that for $p = 7/8$, we have a sequence $(\tilde{a}_k)$ such that for every ϵ positive and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an N_0 and n_1 so that for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k^{N,n_1} > \tilde{a}_k, \forall k \leq k_0) > 7/8 \text{ and } q^{n_1} < \epsilon/6.$$

Let N_1 be such that $m_N \geq k_0$, $b_N(n_1) < \epsilon/3$, and $a_N(n_1) < \epsilon/6$ where m_N, b_N, and a_N are from Theorem 6.2.2. Finally take $N_2 = \tilde{N}$ from Lemma 8.0.9 for $\eta = 1/8$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(R_{12} < -\epsilon) > \epsilon/3) < \frac{1}{8}$$

for $N \geq N_2$. Set $N^* = \max N_i$. Then for all $N \geq N^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k^{N,n_1} > \tilde{a}_k, \forall k \leq k_0; \mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(R_{12} < -\epsilon) < \epsilon/3) \geq 3/4. \tag{8.0.2}$$

Note that

$$\{Y_k^{N,n_1} > \tilde{a}_k, \forall k \leq k_0\} \subset E_N^{n_1}.$$

where $E_N^{n_1}$ is the E^N corresponding to the case where the admissible sequence is q^{n_1} from Theorem 1.2.2. (We remind the reader that by definition $(E^N)^c \subseteq \{Y_i = \emptyset\}$ By definition of the latter set and (8.0.2), we then know that with probability at least $3/4$, for $l \neq k \leq k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle |R_{12}| \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in \tilde{Y}_k^{N,n_1}, \sigma^2 \in \tilde{Y}_l^{N,n_1}} \right\rangle &\leq \left\langle \mathbb{1}_{R_{12} < -\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \right\rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \left\langle \mathbb{1}_{|R_{12}| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in \tilde{Y}_k^{N,n_1}, \sigma^2 \in \tilde{Y}_l^{N,n_1}} \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathbb{1}_{R_{12} > \frac{\epsilon}{3}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in \tilde{Y}_k^{N,n_1}, \sigma^2 \in \tilde{Y}_l^{N,n_1}} \right\rangle \\ &= I + II + III.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $I < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ by choice of N_*. Similarly by definition of $E_N^{n_1}$, choice of N_*, and the fact that $q^{n_1} + a_N(n_1) < \epsilon/3$,

$$III \leq g_{k,l,\epsilon_{n_1(N)}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq b_N(n_1) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Finally $II < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, by definition so that

$$\left\langle |R_{12}| \mathbb{1}_{\sigma^1 \in \tilde{Y}_k^{N,n_1}, \sigma^2 \in \tilde{Y}_l^{N,n_1}} \right\rangle \leq \epsilon$$

as desired. □

9. The proof of Corollary 2.2.1

As the proof of Corollary 2.2.1 a tedious but straightforward modification of the proof of Theorem 1.2.2. In the interest of space, we leave out technical details that are just repetitions up of the arguments above up to a small modification. We begin with the following lemmas. Their proofs are exactly as before, so we omit them.

Lemma 9.0.11. *Let $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$ and $\Delta > 0$. For all Δ, there is a sequence $N_2(n;\Delta)$ such that for all $N \geq N_2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes 2}(R_{12} > q_* + \Delta) < \epsilon_n$$

Lemma 9.0.12. *For all $\epsilon, \Delta > 0$ and N, let*

$$h_{\epsilon,\Delta}^N(\sigma) = \mu_N^{\otimes 2}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 : (\sigma^i, \sigma) \geq q_* - \Delta - \epsilon, \forall i \in [2]; R_{12} \geq q_* + \Delta).$$

Fix M, m and let ϵ_n be as above. Then for $N \geq N_2(n;\Delta)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\left(\sum_{\alpha \in \partial\tau_m^i} h_{\epsilon_n,\Delta}^N(\sigma^\alpha) < \sqrt{\epsilon_n}, \forall i \in M\right) \geq 1 - Mm^{r+1}\sqrt{\epsilon_n}$$

Lemma 9.0.13. *Let $\epsilon_n = 1/2^n$. For all $n, \Delta > 0$, there is an $N_3(n,\Delta)$ such that for all $N \geq N_3(n;\Delta)$*

$$\zeta_N[q_* - \Delta + \epsilon_n, 1] \geq \zeta\{q_*\} - \epsilon_n$$

We then have the following modification of Lemma 6.2.1.

Lemma 9.0.14. *$\forall \eta, \epsilon, \delta$, and for all $\Delta > 0$, if we let $q_r = q_* - \Delta$ and chose $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^{r-1}$ so that the sequence $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ is ζ-admissible, then there is an $m(\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta), M(\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta), n_0(\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta)$ and a sequence $\tilde{N}_1(n;\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta)$ such that for $n \geq n_0$ and $N \geq \tilde{N}_1(n)$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}\Bigg(\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^M E_{\tau_m^i,\epsilon,\delta}^{\Delta}(\mu_N)\right) \bigcap_{i=1}^M \left\{\sum_{\alpha \in \tau_m^i} f_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma_N^\alpha) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\} \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha \sim \beta \in \tau_m^i} g_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_n}^N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\} \\ \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha \in \partial\tau_m^i} h_{\epsilon_n,\Delta}^N(\sigma^\alpha) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\}\Bigg) \geq 1 - \eta\end{aligned}$$

where by $E^{\Delta}_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}$ we are making the dependence of $E_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}$ on $q_r = q_* - \Delta$ explicit

Proof. This is the same as in Lemma 6.2.1, except now N_0 and N_1 depend on Δ as well and we take

$$\tilde{N}_1(n;\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta) = \max\{N_0(\eta,\epsilon,\delta,\Delta), N_1(n,\Delta), N_2(n;\Delta), N_3(n;\Delta)\},$$

the expression (6.2.1) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(A\cap B\cap C\cap D) \geq 1-\eta/2 - M(m^{2r+2}+m^{r+1}+m^r)\sqrt{\epsilon_n}.$$

and n_0 becomes $n_0 \geq \lceil 2\lg\left(2M(m^{2r+2}+rm^r+m^r)/\eta\right)\rceil$. □

We then have the following proposition.

Proposition 9.0.15. *Fix $\{q_k\}_{k\leq r-1}$ and $\Delta_n > 0$ such that $\Delta_n \to 0$; such that if $q_r = q_* - \Delta_n$, $\{q_k\}_{k\leq r}$ is a ζ-admissible sequence; and such that such that that $q_{r-1} < q_* - \tilde{\Delta}_1$. Then there is a monotone increasing function $n_0(N)$ such that and $\lim_{N\to\infty} n_0(N) = \infty$ and a sequence of sets $\{\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}_r}$ such that they are $(\epsilon_{n_0(N)},0)$-hierarchically exhausting and $(\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}},\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0(N)}})$-hierarchically clustering for μ_N,except with the modification that (1.1.1) for $k=r$ has $q_r(N) = q_* - \Delta_{n_0(N)}$. Furthermore, these sets have the property that there are sequences c_N, d_N, p_N tending to zero such that for all $\alpha \in \partial\tau_{m_N}$,*

$$\int_{\tilde{X}^2_{\alpha,N}} |R_{12}-q_*| d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} < c_N \mu_N(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N})^2 + d_N. \tag{9.0.3}$$

with probability at least $1-p_N$

Proof. We begin as in Theorem 6.2.2 by fixing $\nu\in\mathbb{N}$, and letting $\eta_\nu = \epsilon_\nu = \delta_\nu = 1/2^\nu$. Consider the set

$$E_\nu^N = \bigcup_{i=1}^{M_\nu} E^{\Delta_\nu}_{\tau^i_{m_\nu},\epsilon_\nu,\delta_\nu}(\mu_N) \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\in\tau_{m_\nu}} f^N_{|\alpha|,\epsilon_n}(\sigma^\alpha_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\} \cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\nsim\beta} g^N_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_N) \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_n}\right\}$$
$$\cap \left\{\sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau_{m_\nu}} h^N_{\epsilon_n,\Delta_\nu}(\sigma^\alpha) \leq \epsilon_n\right\}$$

Then, by Lemma 9.0.14, we know that there are m, M, n_0 all functions of ν and a sequence $\tilde{N}_1(n;\nu)$ such that for $n\geq n_0$ and $N\geq \tilde{N}_1(n;\nu)$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(E_\nu^N) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^\nu}$$

as before. Choose m, M, and n_0 as before so that they tend to infinity with ν, choose $N(\nu)$ as before, and define $\nu(N)$ as before. We then define $E^N = E^N_{\nu(N)}$ as before. Then we know that

$$\mathbb{E}\mu_N^{\otimes\infty}(E^N) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^{\nu(N)}}$$

as before. Define i and C_α as per Theorem 6.2.2 and define $\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N}$ and $X_{\alpha,N}$ in the same way as the $\tilde{Y}_{\alpha,N}$ and $Y_{\alpha,N}$ from Section 6.3. That these sets have the clustering and exhausting properties as before is the same as in Theorem 1.2.2. It remains to verify (9.0.3). It suffices to check this

inequality on E^N. In this case, we see that for $\alpha \in \partial\tau_{m_{\nu(N)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\tilde{X}^2_{\alpha,N}} |R_{12}-q_*| d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} &\leq \int_{\tilde{X}^2_{\alpha,N}} |R_{12}-q_*| \Bigg(\mathbb{1}_{R_{12}>q_*+\Delta_{\nu(N)}} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{R_{12}\in[q_*-\Delta_{\nu(N)}-\epsilon_{n_0(N)},q_*+\Delta_{\nu(N)})} + \mathbb{1}_{R_{12}<q_*-\Delta_{\nu(N)}+\epsilon_{n_0(N)}} \Bigg) d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} \\ &\leq 2h^N(\sigma^\alpha) + (\Delta_{\nu(N)}+\epsilon_{n_0(N)})\mu_N(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N})^2 + 2f^N_{r,\epsilon_{n_0(N)}}(\sigma^\alpha) \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0}(N)} + (\Delta_{\nu(N)}+\epsilon_{n_0(N)})\mu_N(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N})^2\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of $\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N}$. Set $c_N = (\Delta_{\nu(N)}+\epsilon_{n_0(N)})$, $d_N = 4\sqrt{\epsilon_{n_0}(N)}$ and $p_N = \frac{1}{2^{\nu(N)}}$ to get the result. □

Proposition 9.0.16. *If we let $X_{\alpha,N}$ be the weights of the $\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N}$ in Proposition 9.0.15, then if we let $\mathbf{v}^N = (v_n^N)$ be the masses of the leaves arranged in decreasing order, then $\mathbf{v}^N \overset{(d)}{\to} \mathbf{v}$ where $\mathbf{v}$ are the points of a $PD(1-\zeta\{q_*\})$.Furthermore, if we let $\mathbf{w}^N$ be the weights X_α placed in standard order, then $\mathbf{w}^N \overset{(d)}{\to} \mathbf{w}$ where $\mathbf{w}$ is an $RPC(\Gamma_*\zeta)$ where $\Gamma_*\zeta$ is the push forward of ζ through Γ as defined in* (7.2.1)

Proof. This is essentially as before with the following minor modifications. First, modify ϕ_κ from Lemma 6.3.1 to be $\phi_{\kappa,\lambda}$ with $\kappa > \lambda > 0$, be the piecewise linear function that is 0 until $q_*-\kappa$ and 1 after $q_*-\lambda$. Most of the proof of Lemma 6.3.1 stays the same, replacing q_r with $q_*-\lambda$ and $q_r-\kappa$ with $q_*-\kappa$,except: in V you only have case (i) with $q_*-\Delta_n-\epsilon_{n_0}$, and in VI, instead of cutting off the second interval at $q_*+\kappa$, cut it off at $q_*-\Delta_n+\epsilon_{n_0}$ and use the bound

$$\limsup \zeta_N[q_*-\kappa, q_*-\Delta_n+\epsilon_{n_0}) \leq \limsup(\zeta_N[q_*-\kappa,1]-\zeta[q_*-\Delta_m+\epsilon_{n_0})) \leq \zeta[q_*-\kappa,1)-\zeta\{q_*\}$$

then all of the proofs in Section 6.3 follow through *mutatus mutandis*.

Similarly for Lemma 7.2.1, the arguments do not change if $k < r-1$, if $k=r$ then $\mathbb{1}_A = U_{12}$ so you can use the above approximation. if $k = r-1$, you let q_{k+1} be $q_*-\lambda$, $II(i)$ is instead naively bounded by

$$\zeta_N[q_*-\lambda,1]$$

and the second term in III (v) can be ignored. Take λ to zero first and then κ to zero in the approximation Corollary 7.2.2 □

Corollary 9.0.17. *Let $X'_{k,N}$ be the weights $X_{\alpha,N}$ for $|\alpha| = r$ arranged in decreasing order and let $\tilde{X}'_{k,N}$ be the corresponding sets. For every ϵ positive and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$, with probability at least $1-\epsilon$*

$$\int_{\tilde{X}^2_{k,N}} |R_{12}-q_*| d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} < \epsilon\mu_N(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N})^2.$$

for all $k \leq k_0$.

Proof. Choose (a_k) as in Lemma 8.0.5 such that if $(v_k) \sim PD(1-\zeta\{q_*\})$,

$$\mathbb{P}(v_k \geq a_k \forall k \leq k_0) \geq 1-\epsilon/4.$$

By the weak convergence of the weights $X'_{k,N}$, we can then choose an N_1 such that for $N \geq N_1$

$$\mathbb{P}(X'_{k,N} \geq a_k \forall k \leq k_0) \geq 1-\epsilon/2.$$

Finally choose $N_2 \geq N_1$ large enough that $c_N < \epsilon$, $d_N \leq \epsilon(a_1 \vee \ldots \vee a_{k_0})$ and $\frac{1}{2^{\nu(N)}} < \epsilon/2$. Then by Proposition 9.0.15 we see that by inclusion-exclusion arguments,

$$\int_{\tilde{X}^2_{\alpha,N}} |R_{12}-q_*| d\mu_N^{\otimes 2} < \epsilon\mu_N(\tilde{X}_{\alpha,N})^2$$

with probability $1-\epsilon$. □

Putting these together gives us Corollary 2.2.1.

10. Quantitfication of the above results

In this section we discuss how to quantify the rates of convergence in Theorem 6.2.2. Notice from the proof of Theorem 6.2.2 that it suffices to compute N_0 and N_1, and to find expresions for m and M.

We begin first by proving a quantitative version of Proposition 5.4.2. This will follow after proving that the Poisson Point processes involved in the construction of RPC's and the Poisson-Dirichlet process can be localized about particular point sets. We combine these two localization results to find m and M which we will denote by m_* and M_* respectively. We then use a polynomial approximation argument to obtain the rate of convergence in Proposition 5.4.2. This gives us our N_0. To get N_1 simply set $N_1 = D_2^{-1}(\epsilon_n)$. The result then follows immediately from the arguments in Theorem 6.2.2.

10.1. **Localization of Poisson-Dirichlet processes.** We begin by recording the following concentration results regarding the Poisson-Dirichlet process. We end by proving a quantitative version of the existence of m.

Let (v_n) be distributed like a $PD(\theta)$ and let (X_n) be the points of a homogenous Poisson point process on the half-line $PPP(dx\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)})$ ranked in increasing order. Recall from [22] that there is an L such that $\Gamma(1-\theta)L$ has Mittag-Leffler(θ) distribution, and such that that

$$X_n \overset{(d)}{=} \frac{L}{v_n^\theta}. \tag{10.1.1}$$

With this in hand, it immediately follows from Chernoff's inequality that the Poisson-Dirichlet Process is localized around $L/n^{1/\theta}$. We summarize this in the following lemma

Lemma 10.1.1. *For $0 < \delta < 1$,*

$$P\left(v_n \geq \left(\frac{1+\delta}{n}L\right)^{1/\theta}\right) \leq e^{-n\frac{\delta^2}{8}}$$

Let $C(\theta) = \mathbb{E}L^{\frac{1}{\theta}} = \frac{\Gamma(1+\frac{1}{\theta})}{\Gamma(1-\theta)^{1/\theta}}$ where the second equality can be found in [22]. We then have by a standard truncation argument:

Lemma 10.1.2. *For $0 < \delta < 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}v_n \leq e^{-n\delta^2/8} + C(\theta)(1+\delta)^{1/\theta}\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{\theta}}}$$

We finally make a conclusion about tail sums. Let

$$\Phi(m;\theta) = \frac{C(\theta)2^{\frac{1}{\theta}+1}}{m^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}}\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} + \frac{e^{-m/8}}{1-e^{-1/8}}.$$

Lemma 10.1.3. *For every $m \geq 2$ natural number,*

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{n\geq m} v_n \leq \Phi(m;\theta)$$

Proof. Note that by Lemma 10.1.2, for every $0 < \delta < 1$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{n\geq m} v_n \leq \sum_{m\leq n} C(\theta)(1+\delta)^{1/\theta}\frac{1}{n^{1/\theta}} + e^{-n\frac{\delta^2}{8}} \leq \frac{C(\theta)2(1+\delta)^{1/\theta}}{m^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}}\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} + e^{-m\delta^2/8}\frac{1}{1-e^{-\delta^2/8}}.$$

Sending $\delta \to 1$ gives the result. □

10.2. **Localization of a certain Poisson Point Process.** In this section we show that the $PPP(d\mu_\theta)$ is localized.

Lemma 10.2.1. *Let $\eta \in (0,1)$ and m a natural number. Let $b = (\log(1/\eta)+4m+1)^{1/\theta} = b(\eta,\epsilon;\theta)$ Then*

$$P(N(1/b,b) \leq m) \leq \eta$$

Proof. Let $\lambda = \mathbb{E}N(1/b,b)$, $\xi = e^{-3m}\eta$, and $\delta = m/\lambda$. Since $b \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\lambda = \int_{1/b}^{b} d(-y^{-\theta}) \geq b^\theta - 1 = \log(1/\eta) + 4m = \log(1/\xi) + m$$

by definition of b. This implies that

$$\delta \leq \frac{m}{\log(1/\xi)+m} \leq 1/4.$$

Chernoff's inequality then implies that

$$P(N(1/b,b) \leq m) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}(e\lambda)^m}{m^m} = e^{-mg(\delta)}$$

for $\delta \leq 1/4$, where $g(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{(1-\delta)}{\delta})$. Since g is strictly decreasing, we see that since $\delta \leq \delta' = \frac{m}{\log(1/\xi)+m}$, it follows that

$$g(\delta) \geq g(\delta') = \log(1/\xi)/m \text{ so that } P(N(\frac{1}{b},b) \leq m) \leq \eta$$

□

We record the following useful corollary.

Corollary 10.2.2. *Fix sequence $0 < \zeta_1 < \ldots < \zeta_r < 1$, an ϵ, η and an m, and let*

$$\bar{b}(\eta,\epsilon,m;\{\zeta_k\}) = b(\frac{\eta}{m^r},\epsilon,\zeta_1).$$

For each $\alpha \in \tau_m \setminus \partial\tau_m$ associate an independent $\Pi_\alpha = PPP(d\mu_{\zeta_{|\alpha|}})$. Then

$$P(\exists \alpha \in \tau_m : N_\alpha(\frac{1}{b},b) \leq m) \leq \eta$$

10.3. **Quantification of Lemma 5.2.2.** We begin first by quantifying the existence of m. In the following, we remind the reader that $\zeta_k = \zeta[0,q_{k+1})$.

Let $m_k(\epsilon,\eta,r;\zeta)$ be defined iteratively as follows. Let m_0 solve

$$\Phi(m_0,\zeta_0) = \frac{\eta\epsilon}{r^2}.$$

let $\bar{m}_k = \prod_{l\leq k-1} m_l$. Next let m_k solve

$$\Phi(m_k,\zeta_k) = \frac{\eta\epsilon}{(r\bar{m}_k)^2}$$

Finally, let $m_*(\epsilon,\eta,\zeta) = \max_k m_k$. This will be the relevant m. Finally for convenience we define

$$\bar{A}_{\epsilon,m} = \bigcap_{k\leq r}\{\sum_{|\alpha|=k,\alpha\in\tau_m} v_\alpha > 1-\epsilon\} \bigcap_{\alpha\in\tau_m\setminus\partial\tau_m} \{v_\alpha - \sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)} v_\beta \in (0,\epsilon)\}$$

Lemma 10.3.1. *For ϵ,η positive, we have that*

$$Q(\cup_{i=1}^\infty A^i_{\tau_{m_*},\epsilon,\delta}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,m_*}) \geq 1-\eta$$

Proof. The first inequality is clear by the same argument as in Lemma 5.4.1. To get the second inequality we proceed as follows. By Lemma 10.1.3, Markov's inequality, and choice of m_0

$$P(\sum_{n\leq m_0} v_n \leq \epsilon/r) \leq \frac{r\Phi(m_0;\zeta_1)}{\epsilon} \leq \eta/r.$$

Take $k \leq r$, and $\alpha \in \tau = \tau(m_0,\ldots,m_{r-1})$ with $|\alpha| = k$. Since

$$v_{\alpha n} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{w_\alpha u_{\alpha n}}{\sum w_\alpha \sum u_{\alpha n}} \leq \frac{u_{\alpha n}}{\sum_n u_{\alpha n}} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \tilde{v}_k^{|\alpha|}$$

where $(\tilde{v}_n^k) \sim PD(\zeta_{k-1})$. It follows that if $|\alpha| = k$,

$$P(\sum_{m_k\leq n} v_{\alpha n} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{r\bar{m}_k}) \leq P(\sum_{m_k\leq n} \tilde{v}_n^k \geq \frac{\epsilon}{r\bar{m}_k}) \leq \frac{\eta}{r\bar{m}_k}$$

again by choice of m_k. Combining these, we get

$$P(v_\alpha - \sum_{n\leq m_{|\alpha|}} v_{\alpha n} \in (0,\frac{\epsilon}{r\bar{m}_k}), \forall \alpha \in \tau, \sum_{n\leq m_0} v_n > 1-\epsilon) \geq 1 - \frac{\eta}{r}(1 + m_1\frac{1}{m_1} + \ldots + \bar{m}_r\frac{1}{\bar{m}_r}) \geq 1-\eta$$

To get the required lower bound, it suffices to show that the above event is contained in $\bar{A}_{\epsilon,m}$. To see this first note that on this event

$$0 < v_\alpha - \sum v_{\alpha n} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{r\bar{m}_k},$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{\beta\in\tau,|\beta|=k+1} v_\beta = \sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau(m_1,\ldots,m_{k-1})} \sum_{n\leq m_k} v_{\alpha n} \geq \sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau(m_1,\ldots,m_k)} (v_\alpha - \frac{\epsilon}{r\bar{m}_k}) = (\sum_{\alpha\in\tau,|\alpha|=k} v_\alpha) - \epsilon/r.$$

Iterating this lower bound for decreasing k (i.e. up the tree) gives

$$\sum_{\beta\in\tau,|\beta|=k+1} v_\beta \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{r}r.$$

Finally notice that

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\partial\tau(m_1,\ldots,m_k)} v_\alpha \leq \sum_{|\alpha|=k,\alpha\in\tau_{m_*}} v_\alpha$$

So that if $\alpha \in \tau_{m_*}$ with $|\alpha| = k$ and $\alpha_k \geq m_k$, it follows that

$$v_\alpha - \sum_{n\leq m_*} v_{\alpha n} < v_\alpha < \epsilon.$$

Thus we have the set containment we desire. □

Before we state the main result of this section, we need a few more definitions. Let

$$p_*(\epsilon,\eta) = (m_*(\epsilon,\frac{\eta}{4})\bar{b}(\epsilon,\eta/4)^2)^{-rm^r} \text{ and } M_*(\eta,\epsilon) = \frac{\log(\eta)}{\log(1-p_*)}.$$

With these, we then have

Proposition 10.3.2 (Quantification of Lemma 5.2.2)**.** *Fix ϵ and η positive. Then*

$$Q(\cup_{i=1}^{M_*} A_{\epsilon,\delta}^{\tau_{m_*}^i}) \geq 1-\eta$$

Proof. Recall by Lemma 10.3.1, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,m_*(\epsilon,\eta/4)}) \geq 1 - \frac{\eta}{4}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,m_*} \cap \{\forall \alpha \in \tau_{m_*} : N_\alpha(\frac{1}{b},b) \geq m_*\}) \geq 1 - \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

Call this set B for this lemma. Notice that if $(u_{\alpha n})$ are the ranked elements of Π_α and are independent over α, then for $\alpha \in \partial\tau_m$,

$$v_\alpha = \frac{\prod_{\beta \precsim \alpha} u_\beta}{\sum_{\alpha \in \partial\tau_{m^*}} \prod_{\beta \precsim \alpha} u_\beta} \geq (m_* \bar{b}^2)^{-r}$$

Note that if α is not a leaf of τ_m, then there is some leaf that lower bounds it since $v_\beta = \sum_{\beta \precsim \alpha} v_\alpha$. Thus this bound extends to the whole tree. It then follows that

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \tau_{m_*}} v_\alpha \geq (m\bar{b}^2)^{-rm^r} = p_*.$$

Let $X_i = \mathbb{1}_{A^{\tau^i}_{\epsilon,\delta}}$, and let $I = \min\{i : X_i = 1\}$ be the first time this sequence is 1. Then conditionally on (v_α), it follows that I is a geometric random variable with parameter p where $p \geq p_*$ on B. Notice then that

$$\mathbb{P}(I \geq M_*, B) \leq (1 - p_*)^{M_*} \leq \eta/2$$

Combining these results then gives

$$Q(\cup_{i=1}^{M_*} A^{\tau^i_{m_*}}_{\epsilon,\delta}) = \mathbb{P}(I \leq M_*) \geq P(I \leq M_*, B) \geq \mathbb{P}(B) - \mathbb{P}(I \geq M_*, B) \geq 1 - \eta/2 - \eta/2$$

□

10.4. **An approximation theorem.** For $(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in [0,1]^d$, let $X_n(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ be the random d-vector whose i-th entry is an independent Binomial(n, x_i) random variable. For $f \in C([0,1]^d)$, define the operator

$$B_n f(x) = \mathbb{E} f(\frac{X_n(x_1, \ldots, x_d)}{n}) = \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_d \leq n} \sum_{l_1 \leq n - k_1} \cdots \sum_{l_d \leq n - k_d} f(\frac{k_1}{n}, \ldots, \frac{k_d}{n}) \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{n}{k_i, l_i} (-1)^{k_i + l_i} \mathbb{E}(X_n^{(i)})^{k_i + l_i}$$

The following is a basic consequence of Chebyshev's inequality.

Lemma 10.4.1. *if $f \in C([0,1]^d)$ is Lipschitz in the ℓ_1 norm, then*

$$||f - B_n f(x)||_\infty \leq \frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}} ||f||_{lip}$$

In the following, let $\mathscr{A}$ is the class of A as in (4.0.4).

Lemma 10.4.2. *Let f be lipschitz on $([0,1]^d, ||\cdot||_1)$ where $d = M|\tau_m|((|\tau_m| - 1)/2 + 1)$, and let $\bar{Q}$ and $\bar{Q}_N$ the the restriction of Q and respectively Q_N to the coordinates indexed by $\cup_{i=1}^M \tau_m^i \subset \mathcal{A}_r$.*

$$|\int B_n f(x) d\bar{Q}(x) - \int B_n f(x) d\bar{Q}_N(x)| \leq n^2 2^{2nd-1} ||f||_\infty \sup_{A \in \mathscr{A}} |P_N(A) - P(A)|$$

Proof. To condense notation, let $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_d)$ and similarly for $\mathbf{l}$. All vector inequalities are to be interpreted coordinate-wise. We begin by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} |\int B_n f(x) d\bar{Q}(x) - \int B_n f(x) d\bar{Q}_N(x)| &= |\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq n} \sum_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{l} \leq n} f(\frac{\mathbf{k}}{n}) \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{n}{k_i, l_i} \left(\int x_j^{k_j + l_j} d(\bar{Q} - \bar{Q}_N) \right)| \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq n} \sum_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{l} \leq n} ||f||_\infty \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \binom{n}{k_i, l_i} \right) |\int x_j^{k_j + l_j} d(\bar{Q} - \bar{Q}_N)|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that there is an $A(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l})$ in $\mathscr{A}$ corresponding to the above monomials, as explained in (4.0.4). Keeping this in mind, we then see that

$$RHS \leq \sum_{\mathbf{k}\leq n}\sum_{\mathbf{l}+\mathbf{k}\leq n}||f||_\infty(\prod_i \binom{n}{k_i,l_i})|P_N(A(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}))-P(A(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{l}))|$$

$$\leq \#\{\mathbf{k}\leq n,\mathbf{l}+\mathbf{k}\leq n\}||f||_\infty\binom{n}{n/2}^{2d}\sup_{A\in\mathscr{A}}|P_N(A)-P(A)| \leq (\frac{n^2}{2})2^{2nd}||f||_\infty\sup_{A\in\mathscr{A}}|P_N(A)-P(A)|$$

□

10.5. **A Quantified version of Proposition 5.4.2.** Let $A_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M}=\cup_{i=1}^M A^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}$, let

(10.5.1)

$$\bar{A}_{\tau,\epsilon,\delta}=\bigcap_{k=1}^r\left\{\sum_{\substack{|\alpha|=k\\ \alpha\in\tau}}x_{\{\alpha\}}>1-\epsilon\right\}\bigcap_{\alpha\in\tau\setminus\partial\tau}\left\{|x_{\{\alpha\}}-\sum_{\beta\in child(\alpha)}x_{\{\beta\}}|<\epsilon\right\}\bigcap\left\{|\sum_{\substack{\alpha\sim\beta\\ \alpha\beta\in\tau}}x_{\alpha,\beta}|<\delta/|\tau|^2\right\},$$

and let

$$\bar{A}_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M}=\cup_{i=1}^M\bar{A}^i_{\tau_m,\epsilon,\delta}$$

Lemma 10.5.1 (Proposition 5.4.2 quantified)**.** *For every ϵ,δ,η positive with ϵ and δ smaller than 1, let $m=m_*(\epsilon/2,\delta/2)$ and $M=M_*(\eta,\epsilon/2)$, d be as in Lemma 10.4.2, and let $n=\left(\frac{16d|\tau_m|}{\eta\epsilon\delta}\right)^2$. For $N\geq D^{-1}(\eta/(n^2 2^{2nd+1}))=:N_0$,*

$$Q_N(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M})\geq 1-\eta$$

Proof. Let

$$\psi_\iota=\psi_\iota^{\epsilon,\delta}=1-\frac{d_{\ell_1}(x,A_{\frac{\epsilon}{2},\frac{\delta}{2}})\wedge\iota}{\iota}$$

and set $\iota=\frac{\epsilon\delta}{4|\tau_m|}$. Note that $||\psi_\iota||_\infty\leq 1$ and $||\psi||_{lip}\leq 1/\iota$. Since the functions in the definition of $A_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M}$ are all 1-lipschitz on $(\mathbb{R}^d,||\cdot||_1)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{1}_{A_{\frac{\epsilon}{2},\frac{\delta}{2},m,M}}\leq\psi_\iota\leq\mathbb{1}_{\bar{A}_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M}}.$$

Recall that by choice of m and M, it follows that

$$1-\eta/2\leq Q(A_{\epsilon/4,\delta/4,m,M}).$$

Then

$$Q(A_{\epsilon/2,\delta/2,m,M})\leq\int\psi_\iota d\bar{Q}\leq\int B_n\psi_\iota(x)d\bar{Q}+\frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}\iota}\leq\int B_n\psi_\iota(x)d\bar{Q}_N+n^2 2^{2nd-1}D(N)+\frac{d}{2\sqrt{n}\iota}$$

$$\leq\int\psi_\iota d\bar{Q}_N+\frac{d}{\sqrt{n}\iota}+n^2 2^{2nd-1}D(N)\leq Q_N(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M})+\frac{d}{\sqrt{n}\iota}+n^2 2^{2nd-1}D(N)$$

so that

$$Q_N(\bar{A}_{\epsilon,\delta,m,M})\geq 1-\frac{\eta}{2}-\left(\frac{d}{\sqrt{n}\iota}+n^2 2^{2nd-1}D(N)\right)$$

By choice of n,

$$\frac{d}{\sqrt{n}\iota}\leq\eta/4 \text{ and similarly by choice of } N,\ D(N)\leq\frac{\eta}{2n^2 2^{2nd-1}}.$$

Combining these with the above inequality gives the result. □

Remark 10.5.2. Notice that $\bar{A}$ has an absolute value rather than a lower bound of 0 for certain inequalities. Following through the proof of Proposition 3.4.2, one sees that one can still create an $(\epsilon,0)$-exhaustion as desired.

10.6. **Lower bounds on rates: proof of Theorem 1.2.5.** One might be further interested in lower bounds on rates in approximate ultrametricity. Before we begin we make a few simplifications to make the analysis easier: Let $\tilde{K}(\theta) = 4C(\theta)\theta/(1-\theta) + 10$. Let K be such that

$$K = \lceil \min_{\theta \in \{\zeta_k\}} \tilde{K}(\theta) \rceil.$$

Finally let $1/\alpha = \min(1-\zeta_k)/\zeta_k, 1/8$. Since $e^{-m/8} \leq 1/m^{1/8}$, it follows that

$$\Phi(m;\theta) \leq \frac{K}{m^{1/\alpha}}.$$

Notice that in the above all of the arguments still hold if we increase m_k. In particular, by inductive arguments one can show that we can let

$$m_* = \left(\frac{Kr^2}{\eta\epsilon}\right)^{2\alpha(\alpha+1)^{r-1}}$$

Theorem (1.2.5)**.** *Let $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ be an admissible sequence with parameters $\zeta_k = \zeta[0, q_k)$. Then there are functions $n_0(N)$ $\nu(N)$, and $m_{**}(N)$ such that μ_N admits a collection $\{C_{\alpha,N}\}_{\alpha \in \tau_{m_{**}(N)}}$ that is $(2^{-\nu+1}, 0$-hierarchically exhausting and $(1/2^{n_0}, 1/2^{n_0/2})$-hierarchically clustering. Furthermore we have the bounds,*

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(N) &\geq \Omega(\log\log\log\log(1/D(N)))\\ n_0(N) &\geq \Omega(\log\log\log\log(1/D(N)))\\ m_{**}(N) &\geq \Omega((\log\log\log(1/D(N)))^c)\end{aligned}$$

where these inequalities are to be understood up to constants that depend on r and ζ_1, and c also depends on these parameters.

Proof. Notice that in the above it suffices to chose an m_* larger than chosen above, in particular one can chose

$$m_{**} = \left(Kr^2 2^{2\nu}\right)^{2\alpha(\alpha+1)^{r-1}}$$

(note that this implies $m_{**} \geq 5 \wedge \nu$).Then by making a bigger choice for $\bar{b}$, we can only make the inequalities worse, in particular chose $\bar{\bar{b}}(\epsilon, \eta/4) = (5m_{**})^{1/\zeta}$ We can then choose p_* and M_* as

$$p_{**} = (m_{**}^{\frac{4}{\zeta_1}+1})^{-rm_{**}^r}. \text{ and } M_{**} = 4\exp\left(rm_{**}^{r+1}(\frac{4}{\zeta_1}+2)\right).$$

Then $d \leq M_{**}m_{**}^{2r}$. Since $n^2 2^{2nd+1} \leq 2^{3nd}$ by our choice of m_{**}, We see that from Lemma 10.5.1, $N_0 = D^{-1}(\exp[-I(\nu)])$ where

$$I(\nu) = 9(16m_{**}^{2r}2^{6\nu})^2(M_{**}m_{**}^{2r})^3) = C_1\exp\left(c_2 m_{**}^{r+1}\right) = C_1\exp\left(c_3 e^{c_4\nu}\right).$$

Finally, note that we're free to chose n_0 bigger than in Lemma 6.2.1 so that, in particular we can choose

$$n_0 = \frac{2}{\log 2}[\log(12) + (r(\frac{4}{\zeta_1}+1)m_{**}^{r+1}) \leq \tilde{C_1} + \tilde{C_2}2^{c_3\nu}$$

Putting these together gives the results □

Appendix

Ruelle Probability Cascades. In this section we define Ruelle Probability Cascades with parameters $0 < \zeta_0 < \ldots < \zeta_{r-1} < 1$ and $0 = q_0 < q_1 < \ldots < q_r \leq 1$ and state a few useful properties. When the parameters ζ_k or q_k satisfy these conditions we call them *admissible*. First we begin by defining the weight distribution. (In the above, when we refer to the weights of an RPC with parameters ζ_k, we mean the weights as we shall define below. This definition will not depend on the choice of q_k, so this is well defined.) Let

$$\mu_\zeta(dx) = \zeta x^{-(\zeta+1)}dx.$$

For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_r \setminus \partial\mathcal{A}_r$, we associate the weights sequence $(u_{\alpha n})$ which is given by independently drawn $PPP(\mu_{\zeta_{|\alpha|}})$ arranged in decreasing order. Let

$$w_\alpha = \prod_{\beta \precsim \alpha} u_\beta \text{ and finally let } v_\alpha = \frac{w_\alpha}{\sum_{|\beta|=|\alpha|} w_\beta},$$

This gives us a collection $(v_\alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_r$ (see Definition 7.0.7 for this notation). Note that by construction (v_α) is in standard order.

The corresponding RPC is then defined by

$$RPC = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{v}, \{q_k\}_{k=1}^r)$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ is as in (7.1.2). We end this section with the following facts which can be found, for example, in [20]. Let ζ be defined by $\zeta\{q_k\} = \zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1}$ where $\zeta_{-1} = 0$ and $\zeta_r = 1$.

Proposition 10.6.1. *Fix an RPC with parameters $\{\zeta_k\}$ and $\{q_k\}$. Then*

1. *For fixed α, the weights $u_{\alpha n}$ are strictly positive and distinct almost surely.*
2. *Fix a $k \leq r$. Then if we let $(\tilde{v}_n)$ be the weights $(v_\alpha)_{|\alpha|=k}$ arranged in decreasing order, $(\tilde{v}_n) \sim PD(\zeta_k)$*
3. *The RPC satisfies the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities.*
4. *The overlap distribution for the RPC is given by ζ.*

Using these facts, we see that one can also uniquely define $RPC(\zeta)$. We would like to record here a consequence of the above ROSt encoding argument. This is to be compared with the similar result for the Poisson-Dirichlet Process.

A consequence of the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities.

Fact (3.3.2)**.** *Partition the support of μ in the balls of radii corresponding to the overlaps $\{q_k\}_{k=1}^r$ such that $\zeta[q_k, q_{k+1}) > 0$. Let $(V_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_r}$ denote the law of the masses of this partition arranged in standard order. The law of these weights is distributed like those of an RPC with the overlap distribution with parameters $\zeta_k - \zeta_{k-1} = \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1})$. In particular, there are infinitely many of them at each level and they have almost surely non-zero weights.*

Proof. Since the V_α are in standard order, consider

$$\nu = \mathcal{R}((V_\alpha), \{q_k\}; \cdot)$$

the ROSt corresponding to (V_α) as per (7.1.2). Let Γ be as in (7.2.1).

Notice that by definition, if we let consider the Γ-approximator to μ, call it μ^Γ Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\right\rangle_{\mu^\Gamma} = \mathbb{E}\left\langle f((\Gamma(R_{ij})))\right\rangle_{\mu},$$

so that the Γ-approximator satisfies the Ghirlanda-Guerra Identities. Note that by definition, if B_α be the balls corresponding to the V_α,

$$\mu(B_\alpha) = \nu\{h_\alpha\}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\right\rangle_{\mu^\Gamma} = \mathbb{E}\left\langle f(R^n)\right\rangle_{\nu}.$$

Note that if we set $q_0 = 0$

$$\Gamma_*\zeta\{q_k\} = \begin{cases} \zeta[q_k, q_{k+1}) & \text{for } 0 \leq k < r \\ \zeta[q_r, 1] & \text{for } k = r. \end{cases}$$

Let η be the random measure corresponding to a Ruelle Probability Cascade with jumps ζ_k. Since RPC's satisfy the Ghirlanda-Guerra identities, we know by Proposition 3.3.1 that it is uniquely identified by its overlap distribution, which is the same as that of ν. In particular, we know that there is a coupling of η and ν and a random isometry T from the closed linear span of the support of η to that of ν such that $T_*\eta^\Gamma = \nu$. In particular, if we let

$$\eta\{Th_\alpha\} = \nu\{h_\beta\}$$

for some β.

To get the equality of the weights, we do the following iterative comparison. Let $\{\tilde{B}_\alpha\}$ be the balls defined by grouping the h_β where $\alpha \prec \beta$. let v_α be the weights corresponding to those balls from the RPC. Then we see that there is a random bijection $\pi : \mathcal{A}_r \to \mathcal{A}_r$ that preserves the parent child relationship such that

$$(v_\alpha) = (V_{\pi(\alpha)})$$

induced by T since the latter is an isometry and the $\tilde{B}_\alpha$ are a partition. Since the v_n are almost surely distinct, we see that the V_n must be as well. Consequently, π must be the identity map at the top level. Continue this argument iteratively down the tree. Thus $\pi = Id$. □

References

[1] David J. Aldous. Exchangeability and related topics. In P.L. Hennequin, editor, *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII 1983*, volume 1117 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 1–198. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.

[2] Louis-Pierre Arguin. A remark on the infinite-volume gibbs measures of spin glasses. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 49(12):–, 2008.

[3] Louis-Pierre Arguin and Olivier Zindy. Poisson-dirichlet statistics for the extremes of a log-correlated gaussian field. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 24(4):1446–1481, 08 2014.

[4] Auffinger Auffinger and Wei-Kuo Chen. On properties of Parisi measures. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, to appear, March 2013.

[5] Jean Bertoin. *Random fragmentation and coagulation processes*, volume 102 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[6] Anton Bovier. *Statistical Mechanics of Disordered Systems*. Cambridge, 2012.

[7] Anton Bovier and Irina Kurkova. Derrida's generalised random energy models. I. Models with finitely many hierarchies. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 40(4):439–480, 2004.

[8] Anton Bovier and Irina Kurkova. Derrida's generalized random energy models. II. Models with continuous hierarchies. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 40(4):481–495, 2004.

[9] Pierluigi Contucci, Emanuele Mingione, and Shannon Starr. Factorization properties in d-dimensional spin glasses. rigorous results and some perspectives. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 151(5):809–829, 2013.

[10] Bernard Derrida. Random-energy model: Limit of a family of disordered models. *Physical Review Letterss*, 45:79–82, Jul 1980.

[11] Bernard Derrida. A generalization of the random energy model which includes correlations between energies. *Journal de Physique-Lettres*, 46(9):401–407, 1985.

[12] Vik Dotsenko, Silvio Franz, and Marc Mézard. Partial annealing and overfrustration in disordered systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 27(7):2351, 1994.

[13] Harry Dym and Henry P. McKean. *Fourier series and integrals*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972. Probability and Mathematical Statistics, No. 14.

[14] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[15] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, Nicolas Sourlas, Gérard Toulouse, and Miguel Virasoro. Replica Symmetry-Breaking and the Nature of the Spin-Glass Phase. *J. Physique*, 45:843, 1984.

[16] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, and Miguel Angel Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond*, volume 9. World scientific Singapore, 1987.

[17] Dmitry Panchenko. The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick Model: An Overview. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 149(2):362–383, 2012.

[18] Dmitry Panchenko. Hierarchical exchangeability of pure states in mean field spin glass models. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2013.

[19] Dmitry Panchenko. The Parisi ultrametricity conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 177(1):383–393, 2013.

[20] Dmitry Panchenko. *The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick Model*. Springer, 2013.

[21] Dmitry Panchenko. Spin glass models from the point of view of spin distributions. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(3A):1315–1361, 05 2013.

[22] Jim Pitman and Marc Yor. The two-parameter poisson-dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(2):855–900, 04 1997.

[23] David Ruelle. A mathematical reformulation of derrida's rem and grem. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 108(2):225–239, 1987.

[24] Michel Talagrand. *Spin glasses: a challenge for mathematicians*, volume 46 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Cavity and mean field models.

[25] Michel Talagrand. Parisi measures. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 231(2):269 – 286, 2006.

[26] Michel Talagrand. Large deviations, Guerra's and A.S.S. schemes, and the Parisi hypothesis. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 126(4-5):837–894, 2007.

[27] Michel Talagrand. Construction of pure states in mean field models for spin glasses. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 148(3-4):601–643, 2010.

[28] Michel Talagrand. *Mean field models for spin glasses. Volume I*, volume 54 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011. Basic examples.